THE CROZER QUARTERLY

EDITED BY THE
FACULTY OF CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

EDWARD B. POLLARD
MANAGING EDITOR

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER
BUSINESS MANAGER

Volume Three
1926

THE CROZER QUARTERLY
CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
CHESTER, PENNSYLVANIA

CBBD

v.3
1926

Printed in United States
by
THE JUDSON PRESS, PHILADELPHIA
for
THE CROZER QUARTERLY
CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, CHESTER, PA.
Subscription, $1.50 per annum, post free

Copyright, 1926, by
CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Volume III Number 1

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

JANUARY, 1926

ISSUED BY THE

Faculty of Crozer Theological Seminary

EDWARD B. POLLARD, *Managing Editor*
RITTENHOUSE NEISSER, *Business Manager*

CONTENTS

PAGE

THE APPARENT CONFLICT BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION. A WAY OUT. Spenser B. Meeser 5

THE STORY OF THE THOMAS CHRISTIANS:
I. The Church of St. Thomas in Asia. W. T. Whitley 21
II. An Immersion Off-shoot of the St. Thomas Christians of India. John Crosby 32

THE PREACHER AS PROPHET IN HIS NATION'S POLITICS. Barnard C. Taylor 38

ALVAH HOVEY, D. D., LL. D. Charles Hoben Day 47

THE GREAT COMMISSION. Frederick L. Anderson 58

ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND CRITICAL NOTES 80

NOTES AND CURRENT DISCUSSIONS
On Letting the Bible Alone 83
Some Phases of Current Psychology. Stewart G. Cole 88

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE 97

BOOK REVIEWS 100

Printed for CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY *By*

THE JUDSON PRESS, PHILADELPHIA

Price, 40 cents. Annual Subscription, $1.50, post free

330836

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

THE CROZER QUARTERLY is issued by the Faculty of the Crozer Theological Seminary with the aid of funds provided by the Trustees at the annual meeting in May, 1923.

The scope of THE QUARTERLY embraces all the departments of instruction in the Seminary. Each professor is responsible only for the contributed material and for book-reviews signed by him, but he may publish such articles contributed by others as may be appropriate to his department, without however incurring responsibility for opinions expressed therein.

The aim of THE QUARTERLY is to familiarize the reader with results of investigation in Biblical and historical and theological subjects pertinent to a curriculum in a theological seminary, and also to be a medium by which pastors busily engaged in the ordinary work of a pastorate, may communicate to fellow pastors the results of reading and experience and reflection on subjects on which they are specially qualified to write. From time to time THE QUARTERLY will present surveys of recent literature in various fields of theological learning.

Remittances and communications should be addressed to

THE CROZER QUARTERLY
CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
CHESTER, PA.

PRINTED BY
THE JUDSON PRESS
PHILADELPHIA

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Entered as second-class matter, December 21, 1923, at the post-office at Chester, Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized December 21, 1923.

Copyright, January, 1926, by Crozer Theological Seminary.

Vol. III JANUARY, 1926 No. 1

THE APPARENT CONFLICT BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION

A WAY OUT

Professor SPENSER B. MEESER
Crozer Theological Seminary

WHY no reference is made to Evolution in a paper on this theme should be explained. The situation is partly personal and partly philosophical. While still a student in college, over forty years ago, the fact of evolution became a clear conviction in the writer's mind. In the years intervening, during a not unsuccessful ministry in preaching and teaching, this fact of evolution has been implicit, a postulate in all the varied forms of that ministry, and he has not lost faith in God, or in Christ, nor has he lost ability to minister in some measure to the spiritual life and needs of his fellow men.

Furthermore, it is a present conviction that evolution as a fact, whatever may be the judgment of the various theories of organic evolution, is not essentially or vitally an issue with religion, and the renaissance of the dispute at this time is a greatly to be regretted anachronism.

For a clearer understanding of the position taken in this address, it should be noted also that the writer is not a Funda-

mentalist, and has no disposition to impose an ancient religion-experience, or an ancient interpretation of an ancient experience as an ideal or test of the truly religious or Christian life. Neither, on the other hand, is he a Modernist, in so far as the Modernist seeks to insist on a modern interpretation of an ancient experience. The writer holds that religion is a contemporary reality, the life and activity of the Spirit of God in the life of individuals and society, and as a present active Life is competent, as is all life, to organize a body of beliefs, vital and really expressive of the reality men are experiencing. The writer insists he is a *Contemporaryist,* that is, that religion is a present experienced reality, or it is without moral significance or value.

Science and religion are different, and more or less separate interests and activities of the mind, though they are not necessarily unrelated or incompatible. Science is concerned mainly with things and conclusions from the activities which are observable in the realm of phenomena. Religion is concerned with persons as personalities; preeminently with the supreme Person; with their mutual relations and reciprocal activities. Each of these interests has its principles and methods, relevant and rationally defensible. The conflict arises in the endeavor to deal with the science facts by applying the methods of evaluation which belong to religion; or to deal with religion by use of the principles which are regulative in the realm of phenomena. The way out of the conflict here suggested is that this difference be recognized.

Margaret Widdemer writes in a poem:

SEARCH

Where shall we find Thee—where art Thou, O God?
For Thou hast taken away our signs from us,
Discredited the guides we thought from Thee,
And we have only left to show the way
A voice—the wavering voice that cries in us
Once in a long, long while, when soul and sense

Clasp for a moment, and Thy light shines through:
We can be sure of only one thing now—
Our little fevered hearts that endlessly
Toss up and down upon the waves of the world—
Where shall we find Thee? Where art Thou, O God?

Where shall we find Thee—where art Thou, O God?
Thou who perhaps may yet be, not *now* made,
Thou who perhaps *hast been,* and art *not now,*
Thou whose last echoings across our hearts
Perhaps may not be known or wondered of
By our young children. Thou, our God of old,
God of Forever! Speak to us again!
Give us some little loving sign again
That we may see Thee through the glass of it;
Come in some kindly human shape we know:
Our eyes are dazzled now with staring long
Through bleak bright light unknown, unhumanized:
Thy love seems not for us, it shines so far,
Not such as we could dare exchange with Thee—
Where can we find Thee—where art Thou, O God?

When I shall take away your lights from you,
My little spinning silver coin the moon,
My little burning beat of time the sun,
And all My life and yours have passed beyond
To whirling chains of planets not yet more
Than flying vapors—still I shall be,
And ye shall be with Me.

Such is the plaintive cry, rhymed or unrhymed, of multitudes of men and women today; and such the fundamental response that seeps through the fogs of common agnosticism, so characteristic of the day.

Not science alone, but many other conditions contribute to this religious pessimism; but just now the disordered and unskilled minds of many find in science the whole reason and fear for their failing faith.

In considering the situation we do not attempt to take account of all the aspects of religion, nor the bearing of the

conflict on all its doctrines. We consider simply the one basal element of all religion—God.

"God is," says one. "God is not," says another. "Of what use is God?" a third person asks. Some affirm and some deny. What is the truth? Certainly the idea "God" is, but is that all? What do we mean by saying "God *is*"? Simply that the idea "God" is in the minds of men? Or do we mean that an objective Being is, One who is other than our perception or conception of Him, a Being belonging to the objective order? This writer means by the term "God" to designate an utterly Other than ourselves, our ideas, or the physical universe.

Is God? That is the primary problem of religion and morals. Though Fundamentalist may ignore it and radical Modernist may shun it, the existence of God, the utterly Other than man or his ideas, is the primary, the ultimate problem. If there be no such Being there would be no rationality in either morals or religion in the common dynamic sense. There might be social prudence, with its code of laws; and perhaps an economic and social cult with its worship of man. And these might be *called* by the names "morals" and "religion"; but there would be no morals and no religion. Comte and Positivism demonstrated this. Furthermore, since what men conceive God to be determines the character and form of both of these activities of man's spirit (as the ethnic religions have made clear), this primary problem has added significance.

Doubt of the existence of God in the sense above defined is, perhaps, more wide-spread than ever in the history of man, though scepticism has been common in all ages of the race. The common belief is accounted for in a diversity of ways that have taxed man's philosophic ingenuity. For some, God has been replaced by the quasi-personal abstractions—sheer abstractions, "empty concepts"—of philosophy—"The Infinite," "The Absolute"; or by the entirely impersonal forces and functioning of the physical universe—Nature, First

Cause, Elan Vital, Cosmic Force, Law. For still others God is simply a psychological construct, objective to the individual, subjective for the race, which is active in the psychic life of man, much as the abstraction "Alma Mater" becomes a concrete for the college man's loyalty. But as an utterly Other, a personal Being, with whom we may have fellowship, or to whom we may be responsible, or with whom we may enter into reciprocal activity, he is either unrecognized, or ignored, or denied.

In an earlier day a psalmist tells us, "The fool has said in his heart, 'There is no God.'" That is, his private view was that God is a myth.

There have been times since when atheism was militant, when men no longer held their view *sub rosa,* but declared it from the housetops, with a shout of pride and with the blare of trumpets. Some years ago, returning from abroad, this, boldly stenciled on a trunk, was noted, "W— C—, Atheist and Liberal," the owner's free confession of his lack of religion and his politics.

Modernly, something (is it intellectual modesty or the sense of the moral and spiritual implicits of faith), something has led men to a less aggressive form of denial, or to hold their opinions in a purely private way. For some time now we have heard of little or no militant atheism. The agnostic has replaced the atheist. Indeed, among scholarly men and those eminent in natural science agnosticism has become "vogue," having been given some considerable show of philosophic dignity by certain scientists, who, in the matter of belief in God, builded a reasoned hesitation on then good current philosophical postulates.

They reasoned that science, though unable to account for origins, was in no worse way than religion whose God was rationally unknowable. So at least, they pointed out, Hamilton and Mansel, philosopher and theologian had argued concerning the possibility of knowing God. Fearing the deductions

of the Transcendentalists of Germany, who affirmed that the Absolute (God) may be known by "rational intuition" and had deduced from their "intuitions" a theology inimical to the orthodox faith of the time, Hamilton and Mansel declared God could be known only through supernatural revelation upon faith, and supported their contention by appeal to Emmanuel Kant's theory of the relativity of knowledge.

Kant, you may remember, had insisted that knowledge is possible only in the relation of a subject knowing and an object known. Wrongly identifying the Absolute of philosophy with the God of Religion, and calling attention to the fact that the Absolute, by definition, can not enter into any relation, they claim God can not be known, because he cannot properly be an object of knowledge. Agnosticism is thus—its postulates granted—in a position of dignity intellectually, and is thus a favored attitude of many who are not correctly classed as those who deny any belief in the being of God.

For instance, James H. Leuba, in his "God and Immortality," published about ten or twelve years ago, claims that only less than half of the most eminent scientists believe in God (as Leuba defines God), and that only a few more than half of the less eminent hold that belief. These claims he arrives at, statistically, from the replies to a "questionnaire" he sent to the scientists.

In that questionnaire Professor Leuba presents a rather highly developed form of belief in God. He offers the chance to assent to the following:

> I believe in a God to whom one may pray in the expectation of receiving an answer. By "answer" I mean more than the subjective psychologic effect of prayer.

That is, he asks whether they believe in a God who stands in an affective relation to the physical universe, with such control of the objective world as to direct its activities to the realization of the desire of the petitioner. He further insists that

this is the minimum of theistic faith the Christian religion can hold, and I agree with him.

But the inability of a scientist to assent to this highly developed form of the theistic faith does not necessarily mean atheism, no belief in God at all. There are many stages of belief in God, held by multitudes of men, beliefs not so highly developed, other alternatives of a theistic sort, lying between atheism and the faith so defined by Leuba. To these, many might give assent who hesitate before the form presented by the author of this questionnaire. For instance, some, who could not assent to the fact of a God who answers prayer, might still believe in a God with whom we may have moral and spiritual fellowship; or in One who is the ground cause of the universe, and who seeks to achieve purposes and values; to which ends He is intelligently active within the order and movements which men observe. Such men are neither atheists, nor more than relative agnostics, as Professor Leuba freely admits.

Now one cannot forecast what effect such statements, by this and other writers, have had or will have on the faith of men; but it is to be recognized that the views of eminent scientists on religious matters are influential with *all* men, and with some men they are decisive—the latter particularly with students.

In offering to present a way out of the conflict between science and religion, we wish to contribute a few facts and simple suggestions in order that whatever the final judgment, it may be in the light of certain significant things.

1. On the one hand, notice these facts as to what should be the method and intellectual temper of the theologian toward the scientist and his conclusions.

(1) He should not belittle the significance of the atheism or agnosticism of such men as the eminent or less eminent scientists. It should be taken seriously. *It is ominous.* Neither should he to himself nor to others minimize the intel-

ligence, or the achievements of these scientists. Their achievements in theory and practise entitle them to respect. They *command* indeed the respect of the thinking world as workers with the world's facts and forces. They have absolutely demonstrated their sovereignty in the physical world in many fields; and the promise of further conquests in other realms no sane man thinks of disputing.

Neither should he be tempted therefore to answer their denials or their hesitations with a sneer, or speak in contempt of their theories. No defense, even imaginary, is possible by contempt, or by frivolous undervaluation of scientific fact. Recent events have made a fair show of this sort of conflict, wherein eloquent enthusiasts with oratorical fervor on easy tap, in silly displays of ignorance, set the learned world to laughter and plunge the religious world of self-respecting intelligent men in tears.

(2) Any one, if he be but superficially acquainted with the history of the race, and the movements of scientific and reflective thought, knows that the present conflicts offer no new or surprising situation. From the days of the early Greek scientists, with their crude physical speculations, sometimes called philosophies, to the present oppositions, many seekers after truth have disavowed faith in the gods of the people, and have often gone to exile or death as martyrs of the popular religion. We should therefore recognize that the agnosticism of the eminent men of science today does not arise out of the superiority of modern science. The older, cruder, less developed science likewise produced its agnostics. They are not a new intellectual species, these modern agnostics, not even a new order. The progress of science, the increased and deepened knowledge of inductive thought do not stand preeminently either as cause or justification of the agnosticism of the day, though many unacquainted with the history of human thought are likely to be inclined to this idea.

(3) It is not to be ignored that the proportion of believers

to the agnostics is after all nearly balanced; so nearly, indeed, that the theologian can well afford to let the two parties offset each other; and *recognize that neither science nor the scientist is committed either to faith or to doubt;* though it is often assumed that scientists are necessarily and irrevocably agnostic, or even atheistic. And, as for controversy with the agnostic, it is probable, from the scientific point of view, that the two parties are better equipped to deal with each other than the layman in science, even though he be a preacher or a theologian. And what the theists among men of science lack the well-nigh total body of philosophers may make up.

2. Certain things involving both scientist and the theologian should be noticed, without any purpose, however, of depreciating the ability of the scientist as such, and certainly without any sense of intellectual superiority on the part of the theologian.

(1) Let us admit *freely* the superb qualifications of the scientists in the realm of nature, not questioning their ability or their observation of facts; but let them, with us, at the same time recognize that the scientist, *as such,* has no special fitness, or superfine organs, or instruments of precision, or expert ability by which he may detect the existence or presence of God in the universe; no supersensibility of physical or spiritual sort, by which to recognize God if he should happen upon Him in his researches. He has no implements, indeed, by which he can discover God—no stethoscope with which to detect the pulse-beat of the divine Heart; no spectroscope with which the divine Ray can be recognized in the light of common experience; no neutrodyne or heterodyne, many-tube detector by which he alone can tune in on the speech of God. Nor is it any depreciation of the scientist, as such, that he as well as we should recognize this. It is the simple statement of fact, and either his own idea or ours that he is especially qualified to know whether God is or is not, is a blunder that it is time to correct.

(2) This is the more evidently not to the discredit of the scientist when we remember that his primary, if not exclusive, interest is the explanation of the facts of the natural order in terms of other facts of the natural order; physical effects by their causes; consequences by their physical antecedents; to the end that the succession of phenomena may be understood and that the repetition of this succession may be made possible to useful ends in art, manufacture, agriculture, or any other activity of human life. In every sense he is concerned with the economic and physical values, and to know the ways of the natural order that nature's ways and ends may be achieved by man. *As a scientist he is not looking for God.*

(3) We, therefore, are not to look especially to the scientist for evidence of, or for the deepening of our conviction of the existence of God; both for the reason that he has no super-organs or super-sensibilities by which he might ground and certify that faith, and for the further reason that it is not his main interest, indeed is *no interest to him, as scientist, to find God. He has, as such, strictly speaking, no use for God.* He *can* and he *wishes to* account for things and events on other grounds; and would arrive at no useful results in simply attributing events, results, or anything else to God. He *fails, indeed, as a scientist,* if he concedes any event to be in any scientific sense a work of God. In the first place he has a *view or theory of the world and the activities of the universe which makes God redundant,* not only not necessary to his purpose, but, when posited as the cause of things, likely to defeat or paralyze human endeavor. He holds that every event in the world is part of a system, in strict continuity with what went before and what follows after; that the present is to be understood by what precedes, and is the ground for a prophecy of what follows. On this ground he proposes that the beneficent results of the natural order may be reproduced at will, or ill results may be corrected or new results arrived at.

It would avail nothing of information or of useful results

in the physical order to ascribe results to God or the gods, unless it were possible for man to use the gods at will. For instance, to ascribe all the phenomena of what we call electricity to God, would never have brought the whole range of interesting beneficent uses of electricity with which we are familiar today—motors, telephone, telegraph, light, etc. Nor would any of the inventions and processes which add so much to knowledge and progress of the race have been probable, or perhaps even possible, on the theory that each event is an immediate act of God. The scientist believes there is in the universe an established relative order, and that by searching we can find it out, and use it for the good of ourselves and others.

If the scientist believes in God (and of course multitudes of them do), it is probably *not* because he feels that God is needed to explain the world order. It is because of another range of interests, other facts of another order, another line of needs, intellectual needs; and to conserve another group of values—æsthetic, moral and religious values; heart needs, soul hungers, which seem to him to require God for rational explanation. If he believes in God it is probably for the same reason that other men, not scientists, believe in him; and *he* also may rationally, logically, justly, and with sane reasoning insist that *these* values are as significant to mind, to reason, and to life as are the facts of these physical and biological realms.

In a word, neither the materials, methods, or discipline of science constitute any particular preparation for, or reason for, belief in God; and the scientist who holds the faith, in all probability holds it for the same reason you and I hold it.

(4) In view of these facts, we certainly should not demand, or expect the scientist to profess that he has found God, or even to announce that such and such things are evidences of God's activity, simply because he is unable to discover any other explanation in the field of his investigations and interest. *Without the means of making particular identi-*

fication of God's specific activity, it would be dishonest for him to propose that he has the means of such scientific evidence of God's existence; and it would be immoral for us to require or urge him to make such a profession. God is Spirit; the stuff of the scientist's discipline is material. There can be no scientific demonstration of the existence of Spirit, even though there may be a fair show for the hypothesis of an immaterial substance. Spirit, however, especially personal Spirit, is something more or other than mere immaterial substance or force, though we may hastily conclude they are identical.

3. (1) On the other hand, the scientist must heed the insistence of the theologian that he, the scientist, is not competent to deny that God is, or that he is active in the universe, until he has shown that purely natural agencies, if there be such things, are capable of effecting, inherently, of themselves capable of effecting, all that has taken place, or is now taking place. *This* he could do only if he were *practically omniscient;* and such the scientist would scarcely claim; though, occasionally, in his inferences from the field of his observation, such a claim appears to have been unwittingly assumed.

Furthermore, even if a physical antecedence were observable to practical omniscience, for every event, and a cycle of an eternal series of such events were discovered, the question would still remain whether these tracings of continuity in the physical realm were an adequate explanation of the whole; and whether purpose, movement, æsthetic, moral, rational, and religious values, which emerge in the world and in man, did not require another kind of accounting for; as when the carpenter's muscular energy may equal the dynamic and physical effects of the building, and the forests and mines may equal the material effects, but can not explain why the structure is a palace rather than a pig-pen or a garage instead of a cowshed.

(2) Thus, while we freely concede that the authority of

the scientist is complete in his sphere, the phenomenal, and the wise man does not dispute him there unless he also is a scientist, we must offer these two objections or exceptions to his world-view: first, that his explanation of the universe in terms of the universe is a reasoning in a circle and is inadequate as a ground for the denial of the existence of Another—God. And, second, his inferences from his facts, his critical reasoning on facts, although entitled to respect, cannot claim the authority of science *per se,* and are of no greater authority than the inferences of any other critical, reflective student of life and its meaning, who is acquainted with the facts.

4. (1) Now as to the theologian and the religion approach, it should be remembered that *we* have emphasized, our poets have glorified, and our saints have practised the idea that "Nature" reveals God; and that from its facts and forces we can prove his existence. But attempts to make this proof convincing have lost their value. Keen critical analysis of the arguments show them defective in logic; and to have assumed, subtly, what they are designed to prove. However much one, with the fact of God's existence already accepted, may believe or judge that nature confirms the faith, our arguments show defects of a reasoning sort which invalidate them.

But while these theistic arguments have doubtful value as proofs, they have created the expectation that if we believe in God it must be because the world, in its existence, its order, its purposive activity, and its constitution of man as a moral being, has necessarily revealed him. *That is, for evidences of God's existence men have supposed that the only place to find them is in the physical universe.* The scientist, like many others, has uncritically accepted this common notion; but has found in the very phenomena cited as proofs of God's existence, not only *no necessary evidence, but striking contradictions.* Meanwhile he has explanations or contradictions of the supposed evidence, which eliminate the necessary value as evidence of God, which we had attached to the facts. He, the

scientist, does not need God to explain these facts; he can give other accounts of them, verifiable to the senses. How then can the facts prove the existence of God?

(2) We should therefore *base* our faith in God on other than the purely logical grounds, or the physical and biological facts and our reasonings from them. *We should ground our faith in God upon our experience in the whole realm of life, preeminently in our social, moral, and spiritual experiences.*

It is folly to dispute the findings of scientists confirmed by many observations. To offer as the account of the universe the idea of God, and to base faith in God in the notion that this is the only or exhaustive account, *is to bring that faith constantly into conflict with the scientific explanation of physical fact,* antecedence and consequence, cause and effect; while on the other hand, to accept the scheme of physical sequences to which the scientist gives heed, to recognize the validity of his processes, is wisdom. From thence we can move to the realm of values, of religion and moral experience, where we deal with other than the material and phenomenal, and *to ground our faith there is both wisdom and the way out of conflict.* How then may we know that God is, and with him all the values religion seeks to conserve?

Many have believed that God's being can be proved, and we have those monumental reasonings which have engaged the philosophers for centuries—the Theistic Arguments. Since Emmanuel Kant, it has been validly contended that we can not and do not maintain logical consistency in this rational effort, as we have stated. To this may now be added the fact that rational proof belongs to the formal sciences, logic and mathematics, which deal with the relation of ideas. There is no need to prove the existence of the idea, "God"; and if more were necessary or needed, it may be noted that logic is by its nature incompetent to prove that God is; for logic involves for its syllogism a more general and inclusive, under which as a concept the particular to be proved can be

conceived as included, and under or in what more inclusive can God be conceived?

God, if he be, is concrete reality; and when we come to concrete reality logic does not apply. If attempt is made at application, it subtly assumes what it would prove. The way we know that forms of concrete reality exist is that they occur in the field of experience; and if we may know God is, we know it as we know anything else in the realm of concrete reality—that is, we know it empirically—because God rises in our experience.

If any one wishes to suggest that modern radical phychology proposes that the so-called experience with God can be shown to be simply a reaction to a psychological construct and has no necessary reference to an objective order, we may remind him that the same psychologist proposes the same solution for the experience and experiment of the scientist in what he regards as the objective physical universe. So far then the religionist is in no worse case than the scientist, and his experience is as truly and validly real as man's experience with the so-called material world.

I say we do not prove the existence of God; we find Him. We know He is as we know anything else is, because He rises in our experience. "Thou wouldst not seek Him if thou hadst not already found Him," so Pascal wisely affirms. We do not seek a convincing form of logical syllogism to prove or disprove the existence of anything with which we have already had some experience; *for if we have had experience with anything its existence needs no proof.* We may seek by forms of rational procedure to relate and correlate one experience with another, and thus make a rational whole of our experience. In so doing we give rationality to our experience in that it fits into a rational whole. This is the value, the only value, but nevertheless a real value in the theistic arguments—they enable us to fit our experience with the concrete Reality we call God in and with the other forms of

reality arising in other forms of experience, so as to constitute a whole of rational consistency.

No man who has not already become aware of God in some spiritual experience will ever see His glory in the heavens, or His handiwork in the firmament. *Men did not in the past and do not now come to the conviction of God by logical or scientific proofs, and neither will they give up the faith because of the faultiness or lack of such proofs. God is just as truly and really an element, a primary element in human experience as is the physical universe,* and man is as consciously and intelligently aware of God as he is of himself or the objective world. If any man says, "I do not see Him, I do not meet him as you say in experience," we regret his blindness and his spiritual insensibility; but we no more stop trusting our soul's vision than we give up the joy which our sense eye brings us from the sublime and beautiful in the world because a blind man says, "I do not see the beauty you speak of, nor can I conceive it." You may recall what Turner, the brilliant colorist, replied to an amateur critic of his paintings: "Mr. Turner, I do not see all those beautiful colors in nature which you put into your canvases." "Ah!" he replied, "Don't you wish you could?"

It remains to be said that any man, who has moral faculties or spiritual capacities, common human endowments, is competent to know God is and to testify to His existence. *God is Spirit, He is spiritually discerned. God is spiritual dynamic, He is spiritually experienced and recognized. God is moral personality and is morally and personally appreciated.*

And unless and until, expertness and eminence in science can be shown to be the supreme moral and spiritual equipment for knowing God, and until it is demonstrated to be such, we will not wisely base our faith in His existence on either the researches or the inferences of the scientist; but on the deliverances of our own souls and those of the morally and spiritually minded of all the race.

THE STORY OF THE THOMAS CHRISTIANS

I.—THE CHURCH OF ST. THOMAS IN ASIA

W. T. WHITLEY, M. A., LL. D., F. R. Hist. S., Member of the American Historical Society

Our Lord lived and died in Asia. Our form of Christianity took shape in Europe, and we look on Asia as our mission field. It is well to recall that another form of Christianity took shape in Asia, and until six hundred years ago was far more widely adopted.

It is only within the present generation that European scholars have had real access to this story, for it is preserved chiefly in Syriac, a language which has had few devotees, because at the present day it is spoken only by some sixty thousand people. Although there were chance allusions by Greeks and by Jerome, who mentioned that Adiabene was a province of Persia inhabited chiefly by Christians, that the Huns were learning the Psalms, the Scythians were ardent in faith, yet the treasures of Syriac literature were sealed to the West. The stories brought in the thirteenth century by Belgians, Italians, Irishmen, and written down by Roger Bacon, were told in a distorted way by men who were more concerned with the differences from European Christianity than interested in the actual state of things. The Jesuits of the seventeenth century in China and Tibet, though they reported a native Christianity there, were hardly believed.

There are now, however, scholars like Crawford Burkitt, Labourt, Chabos, and Alphonse Mingana, busy discovering and translating original Syriac histories and synodical documents; Russian and German explorers are making known the inscriptions in cemeteries of Turkestan, others decipher afresh a monument in China which is duplicated in New York and Japan; and thus we are in a position to understand the movement from within. The following account is based on the

work of these scholars, being especially indebted to a document published last July by Mingana in the *Bulletin* of the John Rylands Library. Those who wish to know the present position of the remnant can read in the pages of the sister of Patriarch Simeon how the Kurds nearly blotted out the Church seven years ago, despite aid from Americans and English.

The Church has had four well-marked periods, according as its headquarters have been under the dominion of Romans, Persians, Arabians, Mongols; its fortunes for the last six centuries under Moslems again are of mere antiquarian interest; its progress previously is a fine record of missionary enterprise.

The Roman-Parthian Period

The Jews were very strong in the province of Adiabene, round the modern Mosul on the Tigris; at one time they ruled it from the town of Arbel, and the "Hebrew fort" on the west bank lasted till the Arab conquest.

So it is not to be wondered at that a congregation was gathered at Arbel under Bishop Pkidka before the first century ended. Within the next fifty years many Jews had been won at Edessa, the modern Urfa; the missionary, Addai, built a church. His successor, Aggai, sent missionaries on to the country of the Jilanians, southwest of the Caspian, and round its shores to both Turks and Tartars. Bar-Daisan, who alludes to this, left a strong mark on the church. Although there was severe persecution, by the end of the century, reenforcements came from Antioch; and though in a flood at Edessa the church of the Christians was destroyed, the cause flourished there and through Mesopotamia. The first crisis in the history of these Christians was when in A. D. 227 power passed from the Parthians to the Persians: at that time they had more than twenty bishops in North Mesopotamia and Persia, besides an advanced post among the Dailans on the Caspian.

It was about this period that the "Acts of Thomas" was written, and while it is a romance, it seems to embody facts which are corroborated from other sources. Thus it is quite credible that the apostle worked in Mesopotamia, down the Tigris to the Persian Gulf, along to the Indus, and up to the kingdom of Gundophar, where he made many converts, but was speared to death by order of another king. Before long, relics of the apostle were shown in the great church of Edessa, and the whole communion throughout Asia learned to look up to Thomas as their founder.

The Persian Period

The next three centuries saw a great advance, despite a continuous persecution, and the church consolidated its organization. The revived Persian monarchy set itself to promote the old Zoroastrian religion, and when the Roman empire established Christianity, the Persians had a double objection to Persian Christians, both as dissenters and as possible traitors. Yet there were great preachers like Afrahat, and commentators like Ephraim, with a wonderful production of hymns, which form the characteristic literature of this church.

Edessa was still headquarters, and a school of learning grew up there. A great ecclesiastic, Rabbula, proved himself a statesman, able to organize. He instituted frequent meetings of bishops, and we find in the year 420 that some attended from the cities of Herat, Merw, Naishabur, and Ray, and tribes as far as the Oxus. He was also successful in reconciling into one all the parties that had existed. But he unfortunately involved them in the theological quarrels which were dividing the Greeks, and laid a train which resulted in sad divisions here within twenty years of his death. It was due to him that the name "Nestorian" was fastened on this church in European circles: it has always distracted from the church doings.

In his day the question of language became important.

Hitherto the Christians had read the Scriptures in Syriac, a direct descendant of the language of Abraham and Laban in Mesopotamia, and a close cousin of that Aramaic spoken by our Lord and by Paul at Jerusalem. That had served well under the Romans or the Parthians; but the Persians were patriotically desirous of reviving their old language. The result was an extraordinary jumble of alphabet and ideograms; most words Persian, but about a thousand written in Aramaic yet read aloud as Persian. We do the same thing in a few instances, using Latin contractions for writing, but pronouncing the full English: e. g., "cclvi dwt. = 1 lb." will be read aloud, "For example, two hundred and fifty-six pennyweights equal one pound." However clumsy was this style of writing, the Christians recognized that it would be well to give the people the Scriptures in the reviving language, and a version was undertaken at Edessa; and by 470 original sermons and hymns were appearing. These have not come down to us, for the vogue of this "Pahlavi" was not very long, as it was superseded in one hundred and fifty years. Meantime Syriac continued as the language in church, much as Latin continues in Roman Catholic churches today; but we must not let this church usage disguise that the Christians were of many nations, speaking many languages. Besides the Persians at headquarters, there were Armenians on the west of the Caspian, Turks to the east. When the Persian king Kawad was defeated and fled to the Turks, a company of Christians helped him on his way, and when he regained power by the help of the Turks, he gratefully stopped the chronic persecution.

With the king there fled Thomas the tanner and another monk. They stayed with the Huns more than thirty years, and when they returned brought a story of wonderful success. The bishop of Arran with six companions had spent seven years evangelizing the Turks, and relieving the Greek prisoners of war; an ambassador from Justinian had so appre-

ciated their work that on his return he had sent supplies both material and ecclesiastical. An Armenian bishop came to help, and taught the Turks how to grow vegetables and corn, for hitherto they had lived on meat and sour milk. The White Huns now chose one of themselves, and sent him to the Persian patriarch, Aba I, who with the consent of the king consecrated him bishop and sent him back.

Since the Greeks had destroyed Edessa, headquarters were now at the political capital of Persia, Ctesiphon on the Tigris, a little below the modern Baghdad; but the patriarch took his title from the historic city of Babylon, just as the head of the Church of England, though living in London, takes his title from Canterbury. Another patriarch, Joseph, had been a physician, and in that capacity had been high in the favor of King Kawad, so there was a long time of internal peace. We have the minutes of many synods held at this time, with signatures of bishops from many parts. They cover all Persia and half-way round the Caspian, Merw and Herat being the most important outposts. The influence they exerted on the Turks comes out in the curious story that when the Greeks in A. D. 581 captured many of these, they found them tattooed on the forehead with a cross, a custom introduced by the Christians as a protection from pestilence. We hear also of a missionary bishop on the Indian frontier collecting Indian tales, which filtered through to Europe. And it is fairly well known that it was through these channels the cultivation of the silk-worm was brought from China to the Greeks.

The Arab Period

A third period opened for the Church of Persia in the seventh century. The king in the first twenty years was winning in a long war with Constantinople; his armies reached Chalcedon on the sea of Marmora, took Antioch, Damascus, Jerusalem, and occupied Egypt; the True Cross was brought in triumph to Ctesiphon. But the next ten years saw the

Greeks reverse the process. Meanwhile a completely new power had arisen in Arabia, and by the year 640, Islam occupied Egypt and Syria, and had destroyed the Persian kingdom. The last king fled from province to province, and was buried by the Christians at Merw.

The Moslems had a clear policy in religion; for pagans—and so they esteemed the Persians—it was Islam or death; for Jews and Christians, the peoples of the Book, it was Islam or tribute. It did not take long for the Zoroastrians to make up their mind; some fled, even to the coasts of India where the Parsees are still important; most accepted the new faith, though in a modified form. The Christians for the first time had legal toleration, and it led to another outburst of missionary zeal. Versions of the Gospels, even the very ancient composite Gospel of Tatian, were made from Syriac to Arabic; but as Islam conferred the penalty of death on apostates, work in this direction was abandoned. Pahlavi was soon dead, and though minutes of a seventh century synod were drawn up in that language, it was needful to render them into Syriac. This language therefore continued as the church language of the whole communion, though in Persia the Christians were soon speaking a new Persian influenced by Arabic. The "Arabian Nights" give graphic pictures of the importance of the Christians at Baghdad, the new capital; they carried over all the learning and art of the older civilization to the Moslems, who took it along the Mediterranean to Spain, introducing Aristotle and other sages of the past to the barbarous Christian tribes there.

Now for quite a century before the Moslem conquest, Christian churches had been planted from Persia on the sea route to China. A merchant of Alexandria, traveling to prove his hobby that the earth was flat and oblong, came across churches in southwest India, Ceylon, and Malabar. We can verify his story, for there are still to be seen monuments bearing a cross, inscribed in Pahlavi and Syriac. If at first these

churches were chiefly Persian immigrants, yet by marriage or by evangelism they gradually became acclimatized, and adopted the local language, though they do not seem to have translated the Scriptures.

The patriarch Isho-yadh, immediately after the Moslem conquest, thought it wise to give a measure of home rule to the distant bishops, and whereas hitherto only the bishop of Merw had been semi-independent, he now appointed four more metropolitans—Herat, Samarkand, India, China.

Timothy I, patriarch in 781, was most energetic in foreign missions. "Many monks," said he,

> crossed the sea and went to the Indians and the Chinese with only a rod and a script. . . . The king of the Turks, with nearly all his country, has left his ancient idolatry and become Christian; and he has asked us by letters to create a metropolitan in his country, so this we have done. . . . We are preparing to consecrate another metropolitan for the Tibetans.

Almost immediately after, news came that David, the metropolitan of China, was dead; Timothy sent reenforcements of eighty more monks to the far East. The success among the Turks was commented upon with pleasure by the Persian church historians, and with envy by the Moslems. We are now obtaining from the sands of Turkestan Gospel lectionaries written in a dialect of Middle Persian a century after the long and fine patriarchate of Timothy. Then about the time of the Danish King Knut, the metropolitan of Merw wrote to Patriarch John that about 200,000 Turks and Mongols had become Christian, and he asked for advice in dealing with such backward peoples. In this case the movement was due to Christian merchants, and they had only had a single copy of the Gospel to give the chief. This work developed, and in A. D. 1180 Patriarch Elijah III appointed John as metropolitan of Kashgar; one man at this time won great fame by his services as interpreter of the Turks. From other sources too we know that in church they used the Syriac Bible, but had the lessons rendered by an interpreter into Turkish.

The spirit of those times, apart from religion, has been well caught by Matthew Arnold, who contrasts the civilization of Persia with the roaming life of the Turks, in his Sohrab and Rustum. A few lines from this may suggest the new people to whom the gospel was now brought, and by whom it was largely accepted:

> Through the black Tatar tents he passed, which stood
> Clustering like beehives on the low flat strand
> Of Oxus, where the summer floods o'erflow
> When the sun melts the snows in high Pamir.
> The men of former times had crowned the top
> With a clay fort; but that was fall'n, and now
> The Tatars built there Peran-Wisa's tent,
> A dome of laths, and o'er it felts were spread.

The Mongol Period

Central Asia was the home of many wandering tribes. The Mongols roamed a little further northeast than the Turks, and it is hard to draw any definite lines. But under Genghis Khan, the Mongols entered on a tremendous military career, which in a few years subjected to them all north Asia including North China and Europe as far as the Adriatic. Just as the one Roman Empire all round the Mediterranean had given Christianity an early opportunity for peaceful diffusion, so did this Mongol Empire give a second opportunity for rapid and wide expansion. The opportunity was eagerly seized by the Christians of St. Thomas, who for a second time entered China, and won great success.

The medium of this approach was the tribe of the Kerait Turks, who centered around Lake Baikal. In the thirteenth century of our era this Kerait tribe became extremely important. Their king, called by the Persians Toghrul, and by the Chinese Tuli, received from the king of North China the title Wang (king) so that he became known to his own folk as Ung Khan. The Persian Christians turned this into John,

and when Europeans came to hear of him, great legends clustered round the name of Prester John, the Christian king of the Far East. We are able now to read the facts in the Syriac Chronicle.

His niece Sarkuti was a Christian; she married Tuli Khan, son and successor of the redoubtable Genghis Khan, who became known over all Asia and Europe by his ravages. Her four children all bore rule over the Mongols, Kublai Khan and Hulaku Khan being best known in the west. Hulaku in turn married a Christian, and she enhanced the standing of Christians everywhere in his dominions. In 1265 A. D., when Prince Edward of England was defeating Simon Montford at Evesham, the Syriac chronicler entered that Hulaku died at the beginning of Lent, and the queen in summer; "the Christians of all the world mourned the death of these two great luminaries and protagonists of the Christian religion." This verdict contrasts vividly with what Europeans thought about the great Khan. But while the Mongols were frightfully destructive, and blotted out whole cities, so that fertile regions relapsed into desert, it is recorded again and again how they spared Christians; at the sack of Baghdad care was taken that the Christians were neither slain nor tortured. As that century closes, we find a Gospel lectionary written in Syriac for the Queen Arangul, of a Turkish group; this implies that at least the upper ranks were well educated.

Then comes a remarkable story, known indeed to Europeans for thirty-seven years, but by no means familiar. Two friends from near Peking and Kanchang decided to go on pilgrimage to Jerusalem. The reigning khans approved, and gave them credentials to the fathers of the West. They traveled through Tibet and Kashgar, met the patriarch, saw all the holy places of their church, at Baghdad, Ctesiphon, Arbela. But the Moslems blocked the road to Jerusalem, and when they tried to reach the Black Sea and take ship, they were again balked. The patriarch was struck with them, and consecrated

one as metropolitan of China, the other his chief assistant; but war prevented their return as it did their advance, and they went into hermit cells. When the roads reopened, the patriarch sent for them, but they arrived only to see him die. The day after the funeral, the whole assemblage of metropolitans and nobles chose one of these Chinese to be patriarch, on the ground that he was so familiar with the customs and tongue of the Mongols, their rulers, nor would they listen to his pleas that he knew no theology, no Syriac, and could not preach. The Great Khan ratified the choice, and in November, 1281, he was enthroned by seven metropolitans, and seventeen other bishops. They gave him a new Syriac name, Yabh-alaha.

When Arghun became the Mongol Khan here, he was much troubled by the growing power of the Moslems, and decided to try to form a league with the Christians of Europe for a united attack; he chose Mark, the other Chinese Christian, as his ambassador. There is a full account of his visit to Constantinople with relics from Palestine, of a battle near Naples, of an invitation to be in the conclave of cardinals which ultimately elected Nicholas IV pope, of the University of Paris and the appointment of a return ambassador from France, of a visit to Edward I of England, who had taken the cross and listened most favorably to the great Mongol scheme, of an interview with Pope Nicholas who was persuaded to take up the plan and preach a new crusade, of the pope's gift of his own tiara for his Chinese friend, with letters recognizing the patriarch of the East, of his return by the same route to the Tigris.

Arghun, however, died, and though a son was Christian, it was a pagan who succeeded him, and civil war soon broke out. As Pope Nicholas died about the same time, the whole great plan dropped. The wisdom of it was evinced when in the days of that Boniface who declared he was set over kings, a Moslem emir seized power in Mesopotamia, destroyed all churches and synagogues, and hung the patriarch up by

his foot. He survived, however, and wrote to Benedict. At his death in 1317, it was noted that he had consecrated seventy-five metropolitans and bishops.

This romantic biography shows how all Central and Western Asia was disintegrating and relapsing into barbarism, even at the headquarters of the ancient Church. It may be added that the Chinese, in hatred of the Mongols, stamped out their Christians. In Russian Turkestan we have humbler memorials of exactly the same period; five grave-stones commemorate the priest Isaac, a blessed old man who did well for his town, an archdeacon who did much for his church, Jeremiah the believer, the venerable old priest Peter, and

> Shliha the celebrated commentator and teacher, who illuminated all the monasteries with light; son of Peter the august commentator of wisdom. His voice rang as high as the sound of a trumpet. May our Lord mingle his pure soul with the just men and the fathers. May he participate in all joys.

Almost the latest relic of Christianity in these parts is a Syriac Gospel lectionary written in 1374 at Samarkand, now preserved at Paris.

When we read this amazing story, whose outlines and details are growing now year by year, we ask how it is that this great Church of St. Thomas which overspread all Tibet, Central and North Asia, which influenced China in north and west, which had outposts on the southern coasts and islands, should today be represented only by the community in south-west India besides the handful in the original seat on the boundaries of Persia and Turkey.

Of outward difficulties there have been many. The awful desolation caused by the Mongols blotted out ancient civilizations and destroyed both men and property. The massacres of the Moslems have been frequent, and the murder of the patriarch in 1918 was only in line with many other events.

But there was one internal weakness also—the constant attachment to the Syriac language for all worship, public and

private. A church has existed in India for twelve hundred years, and the people in daily life speak Malayalam, a tongue akin to Tamil; but the church never even provided a Gospel in the vernacular till a Scotchman prompted it in 1806, and Baptists at Serampore really printed the first New Testament. We hear now and again of writing in Pahlavi, Persian, Mongol, Uigur, Chinese; but these languages were not used in the official books of the churches, which were always in Syriac. Granted that the version made in 411 is still intelligible to forty thousand refugees on the highlands of Persia, why did their forefathers deny the Scriptures in their own tongues to all their converts? The result was that when the outward framework of religion was shattered, there was nothing enshrined in the memories and hearts of the people to tide them through their evil days. Printing existed in China long before they took Christianity there; but they never printed any Scripture whether in Chinese or in Syriac.

II.—AN IMMERSION OFF-SHOOT OF THE ST. THOMAS CHRISTIANS OF INDIA

The Reverend JOHN CROSBY, M. A., LL. D., S.T. D.,
Sometime Member of the Archæological Survey

The following notes on an Oriental Church, founded by dissidents from the Nestorian Church of "The Christians of St. Thomas" about the year 640 A. D. gathered from certain original sources to which the writer had access, may not be without interest to those of the present day who are interested in the history and archæology of the early Church, especially to Baptists with whom the sect had much in common. The memory of this community is still preserved in curious fashion among the local traditions, and the church itself undoubtedly existed as a distinct unit until the Synod of Diamper in 1599.

The "Christians of St. Thomas," otherwise known as

the "Christians of Malabar," are the indigenous Christian Church of India and claim to have been founded by the Apostle Saint Thomas, who is traditionally supposed to have been martyred at Mylapur, a suburb of Madras, and to be interred at Saint Thomas' Mount near the same city. Legendary or problematical as this may be, there is incontrovertible and documentary evidence of a flourishing Christian church in Southern India by the beginning of the fourth century.[1] They were, apparently, a Nestorian Church, closely affiliated to the church at Antioch; and in 1490, we find them sending deputies to the Nestorian Patriarch who furnished them with bishops. From the earliest ages they appear to have obtained their episcopacy in this manner, a proceeding paralleled in many of the smaller Oriental churches, notably that of Abyssinia.[2] It was from this community that the first "Baptist" Community of India originated, and as we shall see, held its own as an independent unit for nearly nine hundred years.

About the year 640, a deputation of ecclesiastics appears to have been sent to the Patriarch of Antioch by the Thomas Christians to request the appointment or consecration of certain bishops, and among this embassy was a presbyter named Gregorius. He seems to have been a man of considerable learning and one who had already attracted unfavorable notice from his superiors on account of his vigorous criticism of the policy of the church.[3] This Gregorius appears to have remained behind on the return of his colleagues, and evidently came into contact with, and absorbed, the doctrines of one of the many unorthodox sects, existing at the time in Asia Minor. Many of these bodies adumbrated in a surprising way the tenets held centuries later by various post-reformation denominations, and I have manuscript notes which go

[1] *Acta Thomæ.* Syriac. Trans. Ed. Wright; *Doctrinus Addai,* 1876; *Die Kirche der Thomas Christen,* Berlin, 1837; *Historia Ecclesiæ Malabarensis,* Rome, 1745.

[2] Cf. Milman's "Oriental Churches."

[3] *Cosmos Indicopleustes,* vol. vi, ed. 1690.

far to prove that Baptist essential doctrines were held as articles of faith in many of the smaller churches of the Orient, immersion, as is well known, being still practised both in the Greek Jacobean and Nestorian churches. Be that as it may, a few years after his return to India, probably about A. D. 650, we find him solemnly excommunicated by the Thomist Patriarch, Timotheus, and, with his followers to the number of sixty souls, being cut off from the society of the faithful. In spite of the latitude of belief and toleration of new and startling faiths that has always been so characteristic of India, we find interesting examples from the Thomist archives,[4] cataloguing the property of Gregorius and his friends, sequestered by the church, and the penalties inflicted on some of the refractory brethren. Gregorius was to have had his tongue cut out and, as a delicate allusion to his views on infant baptism, be placed head downwards in a vessel of water. The chronicle states with pleasing naïveté that "not having the courage of his convictions he fled by night to Malapuram." Welcomed by the Rajah of Malapuram, a tolerant Buddhist, he proceeded to found a community, Baptist both in doctrine and practise, which survived through various vicissitudes for nearly nine hundred years until, after the Synod of Diamper, it was absorbed into heathenism in the religious wars of the sixteenth century.

It is only by chance that the writer was able to accumulate sufficient material to attempt to reconstruct a slight picture of this unique community and perhaps it would be as well before entering into further details to give some account of the authorities from whom our information is derived.

The earliest mention of this singular body occurs in the manuscript of one Kuan Kyang, an eighth-century Chinese Buddhist, who wandered through Tibet to India and apparently remained as their guest for some days. His MS. is, or was, in the Imperial Library at Peking, and has, as far as I

[4] *Annales Ecclesiæ Malabarensis*, Goa, 1527.

know, not yet been given to Occidental scholars. It is interesting as treating the Christian religion as a branch of the Buddhist faith, speaking of Christ as an incarnation of Buddha, and for an extremely detailed account of the baptism of three individuals at Malapuram. In the library of the Royal Asiatic Society is a very rare manuscript in Arabic by Hakm Abd-al-Malik, a wandering physician of Alexandria, who visited India about A. D. 960, and gives an interesting account of the differences between the Thomists and the Malapuram sect; and in the Vatican Library is an account by a Jesuit of Goa—Father Paulinus Pereira—of various efforts made to bring them into communion with the Holy See during the years previous to the Synod of Diamper (1599). From these various sources it is possible to reconstruct partly the life and doctrine of these pioneers of religious liberty a thousand years ago.

Gregorius seems to have formulated a system of belief almost identical with modern Baptist doctrines, but which in the course of centuries became curiously mingled with Eastern and Catholic practises. He appears to have insisted on the absolute acceptance of salvation through the vicarious sacrifice of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ and upon the Baptist distinctive doctrine of individual responsibility; upon confession of faith as essential to baptism; upon baptism as prerequisite to the Lord's Supper, and upon the utmost tolerance in religious beliefs; but here he stops short of our modern position. Unhesitating acceptance of the Apostles' Creed as amplified by the Nestorian Church in India appears to have been a *sine qua non* for membership in his sect, and while rejecting the sacrificial ministry they undoubtedly taught an actual commutation of the elements at the Supper of Our Lord.

All adult members of the church seem to have been ordained and set apart for the service of the sanctuary, and I myself think that it is very possible that they retained episcopal

consecration, deriving their orders from some obscure sect in Asia Minor.

Absolution for sin was pronounced by the elders of the church collectively after public confession and followed as a general rule by a period of penitential exclusion from the church. I came across an ancient collective formula of absolution in the archives of the Dominican Library at Goa, which I believe to have been used by the Presbyters of Malapuram. If this is so, the words "We by the authority conferred upon us by the laying on of hands, absolve thee from all thy sin," etc., tend to show that they claimed to possess the apostolic succession.

A curious clause which occurs about the middle of the twelfth century allows converts from heathenism to retain their wives if they possessed more than one, "lest injustice should be done and the justice of God outraged."

A long period of probation was imposed before baptism. Kuan Kyang gives a vivid description of the procession of brethren followed by the white-robed neophytes to the baptismal font, and states that the ceremony was performed by the head of the community—he calls him "the Abbot"—and was immediately followed by a ceremonial shaving of the head and a setting apart for the ministry.

The site of the community can still be traced in a large natural amphitheatre facing the ocean and backed by a circle of low palm-clad hills.

The baptistery, now a tank, faced by a Hindu temple, is square, surrounded by colonnades and reached by a flight of steps bordered by Ionic balustrades. The columns still show the representations of the Greek cross, and the half-effaced effigy of a fish surmounted by the Greek "Tau" can be seen on one of the pillars.

Worship was probably offered, according to the custom of Hindustan, in a grove of giant trees to the east of the baptistery. Traces of masonry still seem to indicate that the

church was in two circles—after the Abyssinian model—the space between being reserved for catechumens.

The community lived in separate houses and in early days probably occupied caves in the surrounding hills, some of which still bear the insignia of the cross. The number of the community must have been very considerable, judging from the sepulchral remains. I can find no trace of the usual tax-rolls and census returns in the Court Records, and it is only referred to once as monastery of "Holy Men and Women" and was probably placed on the same tax-free footing as the Hindu and Buddhist communities in the district. They probably derived the means of support from the alms of the surrounding district together with some communal agricultural operations, and possibly were a place of pilgrimage.

That the community existed for so long a time need cause no surprise to those who are acquainted with the unchanging East. Belief in their doctrines probably became hereditary, and their spiritual isolation from the great body of Thomist Christians, and later from the church of Rome, would tend to form them into one of those distinctive castes which so often occur in India, and maintain a rigid independence for centuries after all tradition of their origin is lost.

The local Hindus—mostly of the pariah castes—are probably the direct descendants of the original community. They still on attaining puberty, are ceremonially bathed in the sacred tank and, clad in white robes, partake of a solemn religious repast of flour cakes and fermented wine. I believe this custom, unique among the Hindus, to be a dim survival of the ordinances of their forefathers. On Sunday they offer a sacrifice of flowers and rice beside the tank and in the sacred grove. Vishnu has displaced Christ, but the seed is still there awaiting in God's own good time the revivifying influence of his Holy Spirit.

THE PREACHER AS PROPHET IN HIS NATION'S POLITICS

Professor BARNARD C. TAYLOR
Red Bank, New Jersey

It was suggested that in considering the above topic assigned for a paper in the QUARTERLY the Hebrew prophets be taken as a background, and an attempt be made to decide if there is any relation between the prophets of Israel and the preacher of the present day, whether the messages and the methods of the former may be adopted by the latter in the political affairs of his nation.

It will be necessary at the outset to define the use of the term "prophet." Not infrequently the hope is expressed that a prophet will arise with a gripping message because there seems to be special need of such a one. When sin is rampant and sinners dominant, when the churches are changed to dormitories, occasionally one of the sleeping members will be roused up long enough to wish that there might come a prophet with the message and voice of an Isaiah or an Amos to threaten the sinners and waken the sleeping saints.

It scarcely needs to be said that the term prophet as used in the Old Testament does not mean one who foretells, as might be inferred from the etymology of our English word taken over from the Greek. It is true that the prophets did at times foretell, but their messages were usually other than predictions. The root meaning of the Hebrew word does not give much help in determining what a prophet was. That means a pouring forth, as of words. But such an act was not confined to the prophets. We may get the fullest information from what is said of the relation that Aaron was to sustain to Moses. Moses was to be a god, or as God, and Aaron was to be his prophet. Moses would give messages to Aaron and the latter was to speak them to the people. (Exod. 7 : 1-3.) A prophet

then was one who spoke for another or in the stead of another. But this was a common thing, and something more must be sought to define accurately the Old Testament prophet.

It is clear from a study of the work of these men that they occupied a unique position in the dealings of God with Israel. Each was given a special message for some special time. And the message of each, because of its content, its time and its application, differed from that of any other. Such messages had full divine authority, and came to the people as if from God directly, instead of through a prophetic medium. Other men then besides the prophets could have delivered messages that might grip the consciences of the people because in content they were of divine origin, but such men and messages would lack the incontrovertible authority that was recognized in a prophet. The proper function of the latter may be illustrated in the distinctive function of an ambassador to a foreign country. Any citizen of the United States may present the character and principles of his country to the ruler or subjects of any other country, presenting even claims that his own country might have upon the other, but there would be no authority involved in what was presented. Such authority would be vested only in the ambassador appointed and delegated to act for his government. A claim by the ambassador would be the same as a claim by the ruler himself.

No minister of today may convincingly claim that he receives special messages with indisputable authority from God. He may speak for God, but what he speaks may be spoken as well by another, whether minister or not. Admitting that the preacher knows that he was called of God to preach his word, his messages are common to all others likewise called. Or they may be fittingly delivered at times by those who would not claim such a life-work calling. Nor is the minister of today directed to give any special message at a special time. What he may preach appropriately in January may be as appropriate in June. And what he may preach to

a congregation in Philadelphia possibly could be addressed to a congregation in Florida. The preacher of today then is not like the Hebrew prophet in the uniqueness of his message.

Another fact must be taken into the account in deciding if the preacher today may adopt without modification the messages and the methods of the prophets of Israel. The messages of the latter were intended primarily for the nation of Israel only, or for some individual in the nation. They were not intended for the Gentiles, except in the case of Jonah who was directed to preach to the Ninevites, and who seems thus to have been a foreign missionary. But his message was especially for his own people, and only in form for the wicked Gentile city. The hearers of the prophets of Israel were to be the Israelites themselves. And because Israel was the chosen people of God, taken for a special purpose out from all the nations of the earth, occupying a unique position in their relation to God, the prophetic messages intended for them were unique. God had not chosen them because they were better than any others, nor because he cared nothing for the rest of the peoples of the earth. But they were to be entrusted with the oracles of God, by which were to be made known to all peoples the character of God and his will concerning man. Thus in the laws given to Israel, in the blessings and punishments that came to them because of their obedience or their sins, and in the messages given through the prophets, God was revealing himself and man's destiny.

This peculiar position in which Israel had been placed determined consequently the functions of the prophets. They were to endeavor to keep Israel, the nation and the individuals, true to Jehovah and faithful to the covenant he had made with them. Obviously, because of the persistent tendency of this chosen people to forsake Jehovah who had redeemed them from the bondage and darkness of Egypt that he might have them for his own, the work of the prophets was chiefly rebuke and threat. And the threats, as they were didactic, were of

punishments in the present world and of a material character. But the threats were minatory, and promises were added in express terms or implied conditioned upon repentance.

The king at the head of the people, their ruler as well as their defender, was held responsible for the course his people took, and thus became the object of both advice and rebuke from the prophets. Sometimes the prophets are called politicians or statesmen because they concerned themselves with the affairs of their government. But underneath and determining all such prophetic activity was the controlling purpose of Israel's call. The prophets did not attempt to regulate the relation between the local rulers, the elders of Israel, and the central government, the monarchy. Nor did the prophet encroach upon the proper prerogatives of the king. His work was only to see that the king was faithful to his obligations as judge and defender of his people. The prophet had the right thus to act as monitor to the king because of his special appointment by Jehovah. The king received by inheritance his duties as king, and they were not to be taken from him, even by a prophet. Thus the prophet might rebuke, advise, or threaten a king, because he was God's special messenger, but he could not deprive him of his royal rights. We find more than one prophet who concerned himself with the politics of his government, that is, with the policies of the king, but only to see that the king's policies were in accord with God's will. The strong and rich, whether kings or common people, who oppressed the weak and poor, were condemned in severest terms by these ancient Israelite preachers. This was warranted because the poor and afflicted belonged to God, not because they were poor, nor because the oppressors were rich. Riches were not condemned nor poverty approved. It was a question of oppressor and oppressed. The inherent rights of each were equal before Jehovah.

The international relations of Israel were determined by the fact that the nation had been chosen from the rest for a

special purpose. To them God would give truths intended for all. They were to be agents to teach his will. Israel then as the peculiar possession of Jehovah was inviolable. The land assigned them should not be taken from them by the other nations, and it was an obligation resting upon the whole chosen nations, the king especially, to prevent the Gentiles from encroaching upon the possessions of this people whose God was Jehovah. Israel was not to make any conquest of other lands, but to defend their own. The right of self-defense by the nation was as justifiable as is the right of self-defense by an individual. While the peculiar position occupied by Israel made this the more necessary for them, they could accomplish God's purpose in choosing them only by maintaining their integrity and autonomy.

But it was further requisite that Israel as a nation should maintain a position of relative isolation. There would be danger of becoming like the other nations by close association with them, and the truths that God would teach Israel that Israel might teach the world, would easily be lost or obscured by intercourse with the heathen. There might rest upon them the duty of loving their neighbors as themselves, but the higher duty was to love God and keep his laws untarnished. The time for fuller intercourse with the other nations would come when the oracles of God entrusted to his chosen people were ready to be transmitted to all the rest. That the danger of Israel's annulling its divine mission was a real danger is shown in the persistent tendency of the nation to adopt the idolatry of the peoples about them. To accomplish the purpose of God in calling them their isolation was imperative.

While Israel was to defend itself from attempts of conquests by other nations, it in turn was not to attempt to make conquest of the land of any other nation. It did not belong to Israel, and it did belong to its occupants. The rights of the Gentiles to the land they lived on were equal to the rights of Israel to the land promised and possessed by them. And it

is to be noted that there was not only this right of possession that was a natural right, which made the possessions of the Gentiles inviolable, but the time would come when the Gentiles would be classed with Israel as belonging to Jehovah. (Isa. 19 : 24, 25.) And this divine relationship would debar the nations from mutual attacks. This fundamental truth was expressed by Job when he acknowledged that he should not oppress his slave, for God was Creator of both himself and his slave. (Job 31 : 13-15.)

Since the Hebrew prophets then were unique because of the contents, time, and application of their messages, may the preacher of today use their messages or adopt their methods? There are principles underlying what the prophets spoke that are perpetually applicable, and that may well be recognized by one who would teach righteousness to a man or a nation, principles that have to do with politics. What they taught of the character of God may now be taught. That which they insisted should be dominant in the character of men, a holiness like to God's, may still be insisted upon. The burning words of the prophets may well inspire and direct the minister now in his relation to the government of his country, or in the politics of his nation. Men in authority by virtue of their birth or by the ballots of their fellow citizens, are to govern in such way that the highest welfare of the governed may be secured. Rulers who seek selfish ends instead of the good of those they rule may fittingly be rebuked and condemned on the authority of God's word. They may be advised and counseled by the preacher, if his advice and counsel are confined to what he gets from what God has spoken. The mere opinion of any preacher merely because he is rated high by his fellow men, would be of little worth in the estimation of those who could claim their own opinions to be of equal value.

In such way the preacher may be interested in politics, though not be justified in entering politics. We may well have the scholar in politics, but that is to say only that we may have

scholarly politicians. "Scholar" is then only an adjective modifying the noun "politician." But a preacher cannot be a mere adjective to a politician. He may preach to the politician, with or without hope of doing good. But if he becomes a politician he passes from the pulpit. There have been some who have done so.

What message from the prophets has the minister for his government in its international relations? Of course our own nation, however much we may boast of its greatness, and claim that it is specially favored of God, does not occupy such a unique position among the nations as Israel did. It has not been chosen as a medium of teaching God's will any more than others who could properly claim an equal rank. The need and time for such teaching passed when the hopes proclaimed by the prophets were realized in the coming of the Messiah. The preacher needs then to see that he does not carry over the forms that the messages of the prophets took when they advised their kings about their relations to the Gentiles. Isaiah insisted that Judah should hold herself strictly to her isolation, and make no league with either Egypt or Assyria. Jeremiah advised Judah to submit to the thrall of Babylon. The advice of neither would be fittingly followed now. In the days of Isaiah Judah had still two hundred years of teaching to do. In the days of Jeremiah persistent sinning demanded imminent punishment. The prediction sometimes indulged in by those who quote the prophets that our own proud nation will sink to destruction as Israel sank, as Judah sank, if there is not a repentance and turning from our sins, has no warrant from the fact that Judah perished. Wicked nations have gone on their way centuries after their sins have cried for justice. Clearly unwarranted was the assertion that in the World War each suffering nation was enduring what its sins deserved. God does not settle today the accounts of nations any more than the accounts of individuals by sending upon them material ills for the violation of his laws.

It is true, however, that the principles underlying the prophecies about Israel's international relations may be urged today by the preacher of righteousness. The right of self-defense urged by the prophets may be urged today. Little need of this will be found so long as hysterical appeals are made by army and navy for more weapons on land and bigger vessels for sea and air. The time has not yet passed when other nations are counted as enemies actual or potential, and the obligation urged to be ready for the intended attack upon our coasts, east, west, or south, though the north is secure. We have a "gentleman's agreement" with our neighbors on the north.

But the right our nation claims for self-defense must be likewise conceded to all others, and this will keep us back from the attempt to dispossess them of what they hold. While Israel was taught to abstain from making conquest of lands about them, the prophets did not emphasize the duty of guarding the interests of the Gentiles, as they would guard their own. Here is the need of going beyond prophetic message and example by the preacher of today. The command of Jesus when he summed up the meaning of the law, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," is as binding upon a nation as upon an individual. But love is more than abstaining from harming, or a mere indifference about the neighbor's welfare. To love another is to seek the other's good. As Paul says, "By love serve one another." There is some gleam of hope that the spirit of altruism will be more effective in the future than it has been, even in its application to international intercourse. To serve is coming to be held as an admirable thing, which the preacher should proclaim as obligatory upon his own nation. The love of a neighbor nation should be shown to be imperative. If the question be asked by the nation, "Who is my neighbor?" it is answered by Jesus in the good Samaritan parable. The term "neighbor" is defined not by neighborhood, but by neighborliness. It is not a matter of propinquity,

but of consanguinity, and that as defined by Paul in his speech to the Athenians, " made of one blood all nations of men." We may speak of remote nations, but only relatively. There are no remote nations any longer. They are all in clear view, and our neighbors to be loved wherever they are. The preacher should urge this national duty, and condemn its neglect. To refuse to join hands with all nations who would wish to guard the good of each, must lead to the loss of self-respect as well as the loss of the respect of others. If there is any justification in the preacher's interesting himself in the politics of his nation, it is certainly to be found in the need of demanding that his nation be true to its imperative duty of helping the weak and healing the sick of the peoples of the whole world.

The need of national isolation that was urged by the prophets upon Israel is no longer to be urged. Israel's isolation was to secure it from being corrupted by the idolatry of their neighbors, and to have it persist in fulfilling the purpose of God in choosing them. We cannot now be isolated if we would, nor should we be. We can embody the teachings of Jesus Christ, and promulgate them in the world, only by untrammeled contact with other nations, and by doing for other nations what we would have other nations do for us. We cannot untangle ourselves from the interests of the other peoples who have claims, rights, and ambitions like our own.

ALVAH HOVEY, D. D., LL. D.

By CHARLES HOBEN DAY
Newton Centre, Mass.

Newton Theological Institution celebrated its one hundredth anniversary in June of this year with fitting ceremonies.

During this long period the Seminary has had but four presidents—Barnas Sears, Alvah Hovey, Nathan E. Wood, and George E. Horr. This year also marked the close of Doctor Horr's very successful administration and his resignation from the presidency. Of these four notable men Doctor Hovey has served the Institution longest, having been connected with it for fifty-three years as student, instructor, professor, and president. He has successively occupied the positions of Instructor in Hebrew, Professor of Church History, Professor of Christian Theology, Professor of Theology and Christian Ethics, Professor of Introduction and Apologetics, and Acting Professor of New Testament Interpretation. For forty-six years Doctor Hovey was a teacher in Theology in some one of its branches. Since his graduation at Dartmouth in 1844, with the exception of one year spent as principal of the academy in New London, N. H., and one year as pastor at New Gloucester, Me., the whole public life of Doctor Hovey was connected with Newton. Naturally as the years of this extended service passed Doctor Hovey grew to be more and more a vital part of the life of the seminary, until he came to be regarded not merely as officially but actually its head and front, its concrete expression and embodiment. Even today after the lapse of twenty years, and in spite of radical changes in theological thought, the impulse which he imparted to the life of the Institution has by no means spent itself.

Doctor Hovey like so many prominent men was brought up on the farm and no doubt owed the sturdiness of his frame and splendid health to the outdoor life of his boyhood and early

manhood. He was especially fond of swimming and excelled in that form of exercise.

Undoubtedly Doctor Hovey's original intention was to have entered the ministry and become the pastor of a church. His one experience as pastor, however, convinced him that his gifts did not lie in that direction and we soon find him back at Newton where he remained until his death in 1903. It was soon apparent that though Doctor Hovey was not destined to be a preacher, he was possessed of real teaching ability which grew with the years until he was ranked with the great educators of the country.

Teaching ability is the product of several factors, chief among which is the pedagogical faculty. That may be defined as the power to put one's self " en rapport " with the student, and while knowing the subject as an expert, yet to be able to present it from the point of view of the learner. For this reason not every scholar is a teacher. He may understand his subject thoroughly and yet not be able to impart it intelligibly. Doctor Hovey was a great teacher because he easily bridged the gap between himself and the student. Through sympathy he touched and enkindled the interest of his classes. He listened patiently to crude arguments. They were evidences to him of awakening ideas and as such to be encouraged, not to be quenched by an abrupt or sarcastic reply. Like Socrates, he was an assistant to bring such ideas to birth. Doctor Hovey won the respect of the student also by his candor and fairness in the treatment of every theory under discussion whether he personally believed it or not. No opponent had ever to fear that his position would not be fairly and fully stated. Because of the innate love of fair play in the average youthful mind a teacher has secured a place of advantage when he has gained a reputation for impartiality. Doctor Hovey had that reputation in an unusual degree. He had the faculty in argument of detaching himself from all personal considerations. As Doctor English has truly said of him,

" Doctor Hovey was never the advocate but always the judge." But the successful teacher must not only possess the spirit but also the instrument of impartation. In his simple, clear, concise English Doctor Hovey proved himself the possessor of that instrument. He was a master of definite and easily understood language. As far as his presentation of truth was concerned, " a wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein."

Enthusiasm is also an important factor in teaching. Because of his judicial method, his calm and dignified bearing, Doctor Hovey may have given the impression that he lacked enthusiasm. Such an impression would have been erroneous. A closer acquaintance with him revealed the passion underlying the quiet of his manner, the passion for truth. This was not shown in an eager emphatic utterance and wealth of gesture. His was an enthusiasm of spirit rather than of voice. Beneath the musing manner, " the fire burned." Students felt rather than saw the evidences of his enthusiasm and were themselves moved accordingly. But the crowning factor in good teaching is the character of the teacher himself. Beneath manner, method, enthusiasm, clearness of presentation, pedagogical ability are those subtle emanations of the self which, though unseen and unrealized at the moment, nevertheless leave marked impressions. Emerson's words apply here, " What you are speaks so loud, I cannot hear what you say." Mark Hopkins was a great teacher not so much because of what he knew, as because of what he was. Motive, spirit, the inner attitude toward truth, these color and shape the teacher's message, give it the driving force that makes it effective.

Though spoken quietly and simply, Doctor Hovey's words had marked effect because of the ethical and spiritual force behind them. Young men loved and trusted him instinctively. They felt at once the greatness and goodness of the man.

Eminent as a teacher, yet it is as a theologian that Doctor Hovey chiefly claims our attention. Theology was to him the

" queen of the sciences " because it was concerned with the highest form of truth, the truth about God and man. During nearly half a century he was occupied in studying, teaching, and writing on this subject. For this task he was well equipped. He had a good command of Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, and German. He had spent some time at the German universities of Berlin, Göttingen, and Heidelberg. He had traveled in Egypt, Syria, Palestine, Greece, and other parts of Europe. He was a wide and painstaking reader. He was familiar with ancient and modern theology including the German rationalistic theories. He was also a close student of church history and a most careful and skilful exegete as his " Gospel of John " proves.

Early in his career Doctor Hovey became convinced that the Bible, chiefly the New Testament, contained the *principles* of a true theology, that God in the Scriptures revealed the best of himself to men. It was this conviction which gave direction to all his later thinking. The task, therefore, of theology was to discover, systematize, and correlate these principles, not to modify or change them. Theology was thus limited to its Biblical form, " for in this way only," says Doctor Hovey,

> can we pay suitable respect to the word of God, guard ourselves from the danger of interpreting that word into harmony with our own independent speculations, habituate our minds to a method of discussing Christian doctrines safe in itself and adapted to the pulpit, obtain the clearest and deepest view of religious truth, and derive the greatest spiritual benefit from our studies.

This does not mean that Doctor Hovey shut out the light from nature or other extra-Biblical sources. One of his strongest convictions was that nature or science and revelation, when properly understood, were in perfect harmony. Revelation simply completed and fulfilled what nature hinted at. It gathered up the broken lights of the universe into that " purest ray serene " which shines from the face of the Christ.

Dr. Henry M. King expresses this truth when he says, " Christian theology is natural theology plus the divine Christ and his atoning work." Doctor Hovey had little use for a theology that was chiefly speculative. As one has said of him, " Truth not novelty, was his aim."

Naturally he would be called a conservative. But he was a conservative, not because of a temperamental bent or environmental influences, but for the same reason exactly that another man might be a liberal or a modernist; namely, because he believed that conservatism in theology would best enable him to attain the truth.

Christianity was for him a series of great and vital spiritual facts, and the conservative view best accounted for those facts; in other words, it was the most rational view. Denial of the supernatural in religion left Christianity a puzzling mystery, and Christ an unexplainable spiritual phenomenon. For this reason the rationalistic and destructively critical theories of many modern theologians were satisfying neither to the mind or heart. They were simply speculations of brilliant, it may be, but novelty-loving intellects. Such speculations were for him not at all synonymous with sound scholarship.

Though a conservative, Doctor Hovey was progressive in spirit. In his student days, he was strongly influenced by Doctor Sears, then president of the Institution, and one of the most large-minded, inspiring and forward-looking thinkers of the denomination. Under his tutelage the mind of the young man was opened to the largeness of truth, its far-reaching connections, its dynamic character, its many-sidedness. He saw that our comprehension of it must be *progressive*. That ever unfolding and enlarging, it could never, even in one department of it, be mastered by one mind. Hence our individual knowledge must ever be partial. These considerations induced, on the part of the subject of our sketch, a humility of spirit and an appreciation of the work and thought of others. At the same time he was stimulated to secure as much of truth

as possible, to be ever ready for the new vision that comes with every step in advance. This open attitude of mind Doctor Hovey maintained thoughout life. While stedfast in his adherence to the established truths of the past, yet his face was toward the future. He believed that "new light was to spring from the word." Like Paul he did not believe that he had reached the fulness of truth but he "followed after." He was constantly changing and simplifying his former statements. He rewrote his theology, "making it," as Professor English said, "a new work."

Dr. William N. Clarke, the liberal theologian, says of him:

> He had a fine sense of the value of scholarship and believed in the validity of modern thought. He never feared that diligent thought would be in vain or suspected that progress in divine knowledge was forbidden us. There is room in his system for speculation in the high sense. He felt the largeness and loftiness of his task, that he must work under the guidance of the Spirit. "Within these limits," he had all the room he wanted.

Were he living today Doctor Hovey would probably not wish to be classed as either a fundamentalist or a modernist. While holding many views in common with the former he had the open-mindedness claimed by the latter. He would not have felt free within the confines of a rigid creed, nor could he have approved the erratic movements of those who have swung away from their allegiance to Christ as the center and sum of Christian truth.

Those that have written of Doctor Hovey have spoken of him as teacher, writer, theologian, but not as philosopher. It is true his writings on this subject were not extensive but such as they are, they are significant. His articles on "Our Knowledge of Infinities," "The Relation of God to Nature," "God and the Universe," and others of an ethical or religious nature prove him to be the possessor of the philosophic mind. His searching examination of Lotze's and Schurman's doctrine of "immanence" is a real contribution to the subject. In

these writings he exhibits a comprehensive grasp of the principles involved, a true insight into the real issues of the discussion, a keen logic, and a fair and accurate presentation of his opponent's views. Had Doctor Hovey pursued these studies further he would, no doubt, have secured as great a reputation in philosophy as he won for himself in the sphere of theology.

While theology was Doctor Hovey's chief interest, yet we cannot fail to note how large a place ethical considerations occupied in his thought. Perhaps we would not be far astray in saying that ethics was fundamental to both his philosophy and his theology. It was no accident that theology and ethics were associated as parts of one treatment in two of his chief works, "A Manual of Christian Theology and Ethics," and "Studies in Ethics and Religion." This would seem to mean that Doctor Hovey regarded theology as the theoretical or philosophical, and ethics as the practical side of religion. Both were essential parts of the one great subject and as such not to be separated. There are two attitudes toward truth, one impersonal and the other personal. The first is the attitude of the scientist. He seeks truth as the collector seeks gems or stamps or antiques. His business is to discover, classify, arrange, and correlate. He labels and systematizes. His interest, however, is purely intellectual and impersonal. The personal attitude on the other hand seeks ever to establish a definite relationship with the truth discovered, to find an answer to the questions, "What demand does this truth make upon me?" "What is its ethical implication?" "How can it be utilized in the formation of character?" This latter was the attitude of the author of "Studies in Ethics and Religion." He loved truth, not for its sake alone, but for the sake of himself and others. He loved it for the joy of imparting it. He loved and sought truth not to crystallize it in some system, but to live by it. As he associated ethics and religion in his writings, so were they associated in his living. In his spirit and

conduct he made concrete the principles which he accepted and taught. Professor English who was associated with him at Newton for many years, pays him this tribute:

> His character and intellect were interpenetrative. The center of his character was a personal trust in a personal Saviour. Out of his faith grew rare simplicity, ingenuousness, gentleness, and winsomeness of character. He lived a pure and beautiful life before his fellow men.

In a testimonial from a committee of the Boston Minister's Conference, occur these words, "Doctor Hovey was a lover and seeker of truth, catholic in mind, irenic in temper, charitable in all things." Such statements might be greatly multiplied.

It is not wonderful that such a man should become a leader. Students, business men, churches, associations, and conventions trusted his judgment and sought his aid. Societies and colleges were glad to have his wise assistance in their committees and boards. Notwithstanding the demands of a busy life and responsible position he was always ready to do more. So we find him occupying such offices as these: Fellow of the Corporation of Brown University; Trustee of Wellesley College, of Worcester Academy, of the New England Conservatory of Music; member of the Executive Committee of the American Baptist Missionary Union, and president of the Northern Baptist Education Society.

Leadership was accorded to him not because he sought it—no man was less self-seeking—but because he was so evidently fitted for it. It was thrust upon him. He was called the Baptist Pope of New England not grudgingly or critically, but willingly and gladly.

His was an authority not imposed but freely granted by willing subjects. A great religious leader must have dignity, sound judgment, spiritual and intellectual insight, sincerity of motive, a statesmanlike vision, power to distinguish quickly the essential from the superficial. He must be patient and good-

humored, sympathetic but firm in his adherence to what he believes true. Doctor Hovey had all these qualities and in addition he gave the impression of being absolutely without policy. Moreover there was about him a stability which created confidence. He was never swept off his feet by opposition or praise. His genius for impartiality was unusual. And above all there was always about him the atmosphere of the man of God who spoke as one who stands in the Divine Presence. And so he was welcomed by his brethren as an honored guide and counselor at all their deliberations.

It is not too much to say that, for many years, Doctor Hovey largely molded the theological thought of the denomination, especially in New England and the Maritime Provinces of Canada, which latter has always been a prolific recruiting ground for the ministry in the Eastern States. Hundreds of students carried his teachings into many a country and city pulpit. " The Manual of Theology " became the text-book not only for the Seminary, but for the denomination. Young men seeking ordination steeped themselves in its doctrines and those doctrines were generally acceptable to the councils. Just as John Knox set his seal on the theology of Scotland so Doctor Hovey has molded the religious thought of his denomination in these lands. And looking at the results in the lives of the individuals and churches so influenced, can it be regretted? Where can be found a sturdier religious life, a more God-fearing, church-going population or a larger proportional number of recruits for the Christian ministry than in the Provinces and districts referred to? But the results of Doctor Hovey's work are not confined to the places mentioned. All over this great country, in foreign lands, in mission stations, in other theological institutions, wherever men seek the truth and the uplift of their fellow men, whether they have fully accepted his teachings or not, whenever they have come in contact with his writings they have been influenced by his sanity of judgment, his tolerant spirit and love of truth.

In his busy life Doctor Hovey found time to write several books and articles on subjects connected with his work. Some of these required careful and prodigious labor. It is said that before writing a word of his *Magnum Opus,* the "Commentary on the Gospel of John," he read the Gospel through carefully four times in the original. Other writings of his not already mentioned are, "The Miracles of Christ Attested by the Evangelists," "The Scriptural Law of Divorce," "Religion and the State," "Doctrine of the Higher Christian Life Compared with the Scriptures," "God with Us," "The State of the Impenitent Dead," "A Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians," "Biblical Eschatology," "Christian Teaching and Life"; and he edited with Doctor Broadus and Dr. Henry G. Weston an improved edition of the "Revised New Testament of the American Bible Union." Besides these he has written many sermons and pamphlets on religious subjects.

Many if not most of these writings, except those dealing with some technical aspect of religion or theology, are eminently suited for devotional reading. At least they leave one in a devotional frame of mind. There is about them a spiritual quality which appeals to those who seek comfort and enlightenment on the problems of life. Frankly recognizing the difficulties that confront the seeker for light on these problems, he nevertheless brings to their treatment such a reasonableness, a facility for finding the brighter side, an assurance of God's interest in us, an interest that wins its way even by or through the perplexity itself, that we are lifted into the bright glow of his own spirit. Knowing the demand of the soul for a credible foundation for faith he goes with reason as far as reason goes, and then leads us into that higher reason which "walks by faith and not by sight."

The baccalaureate sermons delivered by Doctor Hovey to the graduating classes of the Seminary, full as they are of ripe wisdom, careful scholarship, and practical advice, are still valuable helps for students and young pastors.

These books are not difficult to read. The writer was master of a clear, exact style. He wrote as he saw things in his own mind, without obscurity. He moved straight toward his goal and cleared the way as he went. He avoided involved and lengthy sentences. The consequent lack of ambiguity makes it easy to follow him. Doctor King says of this characteristic of his pen, "His doctrine may have been the doctrine of God, but his language was the language of a child."

This article is not intended as a eulogy, which carries with it the idea of extravagant praise, but rather as an appreciation of a true hero of the Faith by one, who as a student, sat at his feet and felt the power of his personality. When with us, his humility obscured his greatness, but as in the case of a towering mountain whose true proportions appear as we recede from it, so as the years carry us farther along the stream of time, this man, the beloved teacher, the consecrated scholar, the clear interpreter of truth, the friend of God and man, grows greater as we see him in a truer because longer perspective.

THE GREAT COMMISSION

Professor FREDERICK L. ANDERSON
Newton Center, Mass.

For many years there has been going on a somewhat desultory debate on the authenticity of the Great Commission. As the echoes of the discussion are beginning to reach the ears of the laity, it may perhaps be useful at this time to set forth the facts and arguments employed and sum up the debate so far as it has proceeded.

First of all, a word of reassurance. The cause of foreign missions does not stand or fall with the authenticity of the Great Commission. None of the great fundamentals of Christian faith or the mighty movements of the Spirit in the history of the Church rest on isolated passages of Scripture. The missionary enterprise draws its life from the very nature of our religion, from the spirit and work of Jesus and of Paul, and from those inner divine impulses which have sent forth the Careys, the Judsons, the Livingstones, the Duffs, and the Cloughs to the uttermost parts of the earth and still operate in the hearts of men. But though this thought materially minimizes the importance of our study, the Great Commission, which comes with the authority and promise of the risen Christ; which gives so tersely and yet so comprehensively the marching orders and program of the Church—aggression, evangelization, organization, and education; and whose exalted feeling and noble form make it a stirring war-cry for our far-flung missionary battle-line, cannot be surrendered unless truth plainly demands it.

Of course, this question is undebatable to the minds of two sorts of people: first, to those who think that the Bible should not be the subject of investigation, and second, to those who reject the possibility of any real resurrection of Jesus and consequently the possibility of any words of a risen Christ.

To the latter, the only remaining problem is how to account for the origin of this Great Commission, since to their mind the author's statement that it came from the lips of Jesus after his resurrection is incredible. The interested readers of this paper are therefore reduced to those who believe in a real resurrection of Jesus and, at the same time, think that the Bible should be candidly examined, and that all arguments brought against it or any view of it or any part of it should be fairly faced and decided by the weight of evidence.

We may divide the subject into three rather unequal parts. There are (1) the arguments against the Great Commission as a whole, especially the command to enter upon an aggressive campaign of world-wide evangelization, (2) the arguments against the command to baptize, and (3) the arguments against the so-called trinitarian formula, " into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."

While it is easily conceivable that if the arguments under (2) or (3) should prove the spuriousness of the baptismal clause only, the rest might remain intact, still if that clause should be shown to be vulnerable, the whole Commission and the whole passage in which it stands, might be weakened. Our threefold division of the subject is therefore not above criticism from the logical point of view, and it is with that fact clearly in mind that we adopt this analysis for convenience, with the hope of allowing for its logical imperfections in our conclusion.

What then are the critical objections to the Great Commission as a whole?

They may be stated summarily as follows: (1) It stands alone in a section peculiar to Matthew and therefore belongs to the most suspicious stratum of the Synoptic history; (2) the command to baptize also stands alone in the Gospels and comes with a shock of surprise to the attentive reader of Matthew who has heard nothing of baptism since John the Baptist's imprisonment; (3) the trinitarian formula hardly

sounds like the first century; indeed a few textual facts seem to point to it as a second century addition to the gospel; (4) Jesus had no such world vision, and (5) the proof that he never uttered these words is found in the subsequent history. They are nowhere referred to in the Acts or the Epistles, they are never the basis of missionary argument or appeal, the actual missionary history evolved with no reference to them. If the Lord ever spoke these words, the apostles and the earliest church either entirely forgot them, almost an impossibility, or were so indifferent and disobedient that even the men of Cyprus and Cyrene and Paul himself could hardly shake the Jerusalem Christians out of their lethargy and indeed opposition to the Gentile Mission. More than that, the Cornelius incident is a flat contradiction of the authenticity of the Great Commission. Peter acts as though he had never heard of it. Indeed only a divine vision, and that thrice given, with difficulty sufficed to start him to the Gentile's house; and when he reported the conversion and baptism of the centurion and his household to the brethren in Jerusalem, all these scenes and new experiences did not remind him of the Great Commission although it would have served so well in his speech in justification of his action; nor did it occur to any of his Christian brethren whom he addressed, for after hearing of the gift of the Spirit to the heathen, they say as though in glad surprise at some new idea, " Then also to the Gentiles has God given repentance unto life " (Acts 11 : 18). Paul, the greatest Christian missionary, never refers to any word of the Lord in justification of his enterprise, but at the Conference at Jerusalem in Acts XV, rests his defense upon the signs and wonders which God had done among the Gentiles through him. If he knew anything about the Great Commission, that was the juncture at which he should have mentioned it, but he did not do so on that day or at any subsequent time.

Before considering these arguments in detail, I may say that I believe that the First Gospel was written in late 69 or

more probably early 70, when Jerusalem was surrounded by the Roman armies and all sensible men knew that her doom was sealed. Although just such passages as the Great Commission seem at first sight to suggest a later date, on mature consideration I still hold with Harnack that this Gospel trembles with the destruction of Jerusalem, a destruction impending and certain, but not yet consummated, as certain facts in the Gospel seem to me to prove.

Let us ask then, whether at this early date, 69-70, the Great Commission can be an integral part of the First Gospel or whether it is a later addition by some other hand.

1. The textual evidence for the Great Commission is very strong. It appears in all the ancient manuscripts and in all the ancient translations except the Sinaitic Syriac, found by Mrs. Lewis at Mt. Sinai in 1892, and representing a very early, if not the earliest translation into Syriac. The portion of the manuscript, however, on which stood Matthew 28 : 8 to Mark 1 : 12 has been lost. The Curetonian Syriac, another very early translation, breaks off at Matthew 23 : 25 (Kenyon, p. 131) and so also fails as evidence. But the probabilities favor not only the presence of the Great Commission in these very early Syriac translations, but indeed our very text of it, as we shall show later when we discuss the peculiar textual problem of the baptismal clause.

2. This is reenforced by the purpose and unity of the First Gospel, "the massive unity of the book," to use Moffatt's phrase. Of no one of the Gospels is it more difficult to get a correct general view than of Matthew. It is at once the most Jewish and the most universalistic of the Synoptics. And just there is the difficulty of the problem. How can these extremes exist in a carefully written book? The longer we study it, the surer we are that it is a work of literary art and a masterpiece, leaving the simple Mark far behind, decidedly superior to Luke in spite of the physician's more polished style, and at least the equal of John, who is also a master in

literary construction. It is not annals like simple Mark and even Luke, but under the form of a narrative life of Jesus, it is in reality a closely knit argument addressed to Jewish Christians in a time of crisis. This argument is as follows: Jesus was the Jewish Messiah. As such he came to Israel and offered to them the Kingdom of God and all its wealth of blessing. When they showed signs of rejecting it, he plainly told them that if they rejected the Kingdom, God would reject them. They did reject both it and him. Therefore God has taken the Kingdom from them and has given it to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof, i. e., to the new Israel, the body of his disciples. The evident but suppressed conclusion is, Let Jewish Christians abandon the God-rejected Judaism, whose beleaguered and blazing capital is ocular evidence of his wrath.

This is more than Pauline universalism. Paul never asked the Jewish Christians to leave Judaism behind. It is rather in the spirit of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which in my judgment addresses the same advice to the same situation at the same general date. The extreme Jewish elements of Matthew are implicit in the first two propositions of the argument, that Jesus was the Jewish Messiah, and as such offered the Kingdom to Israel, but the outcome is the broadest universalism found anywhere in the New Testament. This and this alone solves the problem of the book, viz., how it happens that the most extreme Jewish elements and the most extreme universalistic elements are found side by side. To my own mind this argument undoubtedly underlies the narrative, but, more than this, it represents correctly the historical facts and the conception of the situation as it evidently lay in the mind of Jesus.

So the book is a " massive unity." The universalism runs like a silver thread through it all. The Gentile Magi from the East worship the infant Messiah, while the Jewish King plots to murder him. He flees from danger in Israel to safety in

Egypt. He promulgates a new law which transcends the old (Matt. 5 : 17-20). He is Lord of the Sabbath (12 : 7, 8). He is greater than the temple (12 : 6). *The whole people* (27 : 25) cried, " His blood be upon us and on our children." So, as Jesus said, The Kingdom of God was taken from them (the nation represented by its rulers) and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof (the new Israel, the true people of God). In such a Gospel the Great Commission to the new Israel to go and disciple all nations is a fitting and noble climax, the necessary literary capstone of a great argument. The Magi of the second chapter exactly correspond to the Missionary Command of the last. The literary structure and the fundamental argument of Matthew as well as the textual evidence demand that the Great Commission be considered an integral part of the Gospel.

The Great Commission does not stand alone as has been alleged. We have already seen how the whole universalistic strain in Matthew leads up to it. And there are parallels to it in the other Gospels. Of course the parallel in Mark 16 : 15, 16, has no weight, as it is conceded by more than nine-tenths of New Testament scholars that the Gospel of Mark ends with 16 : 8, and that the last twelve verses are the addition of a later hand, a mere summary of what is found in Matthew, Luke, and John. The textual evidence is decisive here and even the most extreme inspirationist cannot resent an investigation and conclusion as to what was in the original manuscripts. But we do find parallels in Luke and Acts. In Luke 24 : 47-49, we find the words of the risen Jesus, " So it is written that the Messiah should suffer and rise from the dead the third day and that in his name repentance (μετάνοια) unto forgiveness of sins should be proclaimed to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem. Ye are witnesses of these things. And behold I send the promise of my Father [i. e., the Holy Spirit] upon you, but remain ye in the city until you are endued with power from on high." Again, Acts 1 : 8, the risen Jesus

says, "And ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and unto the end of the earth."

Parallels are also found in John. In the prayer of Jesus (John 17 : 18), he says, "As thou hast sent me into the world, so also have I sent them into the world." Again, the risen Jesus in John 20 : 21 says, "As the Father has sent me, so also do I send you."

These parallels are very loose, they have no reference whatever to baptism, and all that they, in their extreme variety, can possibly evidence is a general nebulous tradition of some command of the risen Jesus to evangelize all the nations. The Johannine verses do not even say that much, but at the date at which they were written down they cannot mean less than that. If these passages are taken as repeated sayings, which is improbable, each one stands alone, and they lose in corroborative power.

With these loose parallels in mind, we take up the objection that the Great Commission stands in a section peculiar to Matthew and therefore belongs to the most suspicious stratum of the Synoptic history. This, of course, precipitates a discussion of the sources of Matthew, a discussion, which, in a semipopular paper, can be set forth only in a very condensed and therefore unsatisfactory form. Suffice it then to say that the great majority of scholars believe that the writer of our First Gospel used at least three sources: (1) a narrative tradition, either oral or written, which was our Mark or something very like it, (2) a tradition of the discourses of Jesus, used also by Luke, called by scholars the Logia or Q, and (3) a special source or sources, appearing in largest bulk in chapters I and II. Besides this there was a great deal of editorial rearrangement and modification, and some necessary connecting links and explanations.

Now the question comes, to which of these sources does the Great Commission belong? To this question, I have given painstaking study, examining the style and every single word

and phrase of the passage separately to determine its relationships. The detailed results of this study I might have placed in an appended note. In brief, they are as follows:

1. The Great Commission is *not* a part of the *special* source or sources of Matthew, which many scholars count the most suspicious stratum of the Synoptic tradition. My own view is that in this special matter each separate section deserves separate consideration and judgment, and must stand or fall on its own merits. Nothing could be more unfair than a blanket condemnation. Even if our investigation had proved the Great Commission a part of this special source, the case against it could not fairly have been considered closed. But, as a matter of fact, it does *not* belong to *that* source. The proof is threefold: (1) The exalted style of these verses is nowhere found in the material coming from the special source or sources, (2) their vocabulary has only one or two relationships to that of the special source and those not very strong, (3) there are no echoes of this source in the other Gospels, but we see that the Great Commission has loose parallels in Luke and Acts.

2. To the inquiry whether it belongs to the discourse source, we must answer with less certainty. The exalted style is that of the noblest passages of the discourse source, i. e., of the sayings of Jesus. The opening words of the Great Commission remind us irresistibily of the great saying of our Lord in Matthew 11 : 27 (Q), "All things have been delivered unto me by my Father." Its reference in the so-called baptismal formula to *the* Father and *the* Son finds an exact counterpart in this same Matthew 11 : 27: while its "And, lo, I am with you all the days even unto the consummation of the age" reminds us of those other words in Matthew 18 : 20, "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," and Matthew 18 : 20, though standing alone, is reckoned a Q passage by Allen, and this is strengthened by a close parallel in the recently found very

ancient Sayings of Jesus. Lastly the loose parallels in Luke and Acts may be reminiscences of our Great Commission in a much deteriorated form. But the objections to this view are very strong; they are (1) the vocabulary of this passage has no strong and certain relationships to the vocabulary of Q, if indeed the original vocabulary of Q can be surely established, (2) Q seems to have ended with the ministry and contained no words of passion week or of the resurrection period. Still this is not absolutely certain or above criticism.

3. Abandoning for the moment the anchorage at Q, shall we fare better with the narrative source in Mark? But we are almost barred from this harbor at the very start by the fact that the genuine Mark ends at 16 : 8 at the point where the women leave the tomb on the resurrection morning, and that the last twelve verses of Mark are certainly spurious and are so indicated in the Revised Versions, both English and American. Whether Mark broke off at 16 : 8 and wrote no more for some unexplained reason, or whether the last section or last page of his book was lost before any of our manuscripts were copied, we do not know. After much debate on this point, a majority of scholars hold to the opinion that the section or page was probably lost. I incline to this majority opinion and shall speak, therefore, of the "lost ending of Mark." Another item which is unfavorable to Mark is the style of the Great Commission. Nowhere has the ruder Mark attained this grand and noble style.

Yet the arguments for Mark are somewhat strong. There are certain definite relationships between the vocabulary of these verses and that of Mark, though there is also in them some obscure evidence of the opposite sort. The best argument is from the probable contents of the lost ending. Mark, before the break at 16 : 8 was going on to tell of a meeting in Galilee (Mark 16 : 7), and here in Matthew after similar preparation (28 : 7, 10), we have the meeting on the Mountain in Galilee with its Great Commission. Why is there to

be a meeting in Galilee as announced by Mark? Why the long journey and the gathering of the disciples in the distant province? It must have been for some high purpose. The Great Commission was the consummation of that purpose and the sufficient justification for the meeting. Moreover Matthew's summary and fragmentary account, due to the fact that he does not care to record appearances of Jesus so much as to hurry on to his great climax, contains some real difficulties which Mark's usually livelier and more circumstantial history might easily have explained. We have not time to go into the rather intricate details, but the argument has considerable weight.

What then is our conclusion? It is that the Great Commission does not belong to that special source represented by chapters I and II and related matter, that it represents the words of Jesus, either as set forth in Q or in Mark's lost ending, we know not which. It is even possible that the Great Commission was an independent tradition of the Lord's words of the style of Q, used here by the author of the First Gospel and somewhat molded in his own style. It cannot be denied that some of the favorite mannerisms of our author are found in these lofty words.

It is also urged against the missionary command that it could not have been spoken by Jesus because he never thought of his gospel as a world religion, but conceived himself narrowly as merely a Jewish Messiah. This objection and the view on which it is founded is analyzed and refuted in my book, the "Man of Nazareth," pp. 145-159, and we have not the space to repeat the proof there given. It is worthy of note that since the publication of my book, Professor Bacon of Yale has produced new and important evidence in support of my view on this point.

The historical argument against the Great Commission seems to me the strongest, and yet little attention has been paid to it. It is alleged that the Great Commission is never men-

tioned or referred to in the Epistles or the subsequent history in the Acts, that it is never made the basis of missionary argument or appeal and that the actual missionary history evolved with no reference to it. If the Lord really spoke these words, the early disciples either forgot them, almost an impossibility, or utterly ignored and disobeyed them. Specifically it is said that the Cornelius incident flatly contradicts their authenticity, and their absence from Acts XV, the account of the Conference in Jerusalem, makes their authenticity incredible.

In considering this objection, I, first of all, call your attention to the following facts:

1. The epistles and the other New Testament writings outside the Gospels very rarely quote the words of Jesus and only occasionally refer to them. Indeed with the exception of the death and resurrection of Jesus, they only very rarely refer to his earthly life. So certain is this fact that many scholars have maintained that Paul knew nothing or next to nothing about the earthly life and teachings of Jesus, and some ingenious extreme radicals have maintained that the epistles are the basis of the legends which finally took shape in the Gospels. Unfortunately for them, there is just as little of the epistles in the Gospels as of the Gospels in the epistles. Although Knowling with painstaking scholarship has shown that Paul does occasionally refer to the words of Christ, without direct quotation, the fact is that Paul never clearly quotes the Lord except in a single epistle, 1 Corinthians, and there only three times. In 1 Corinthians 7 : 10, he quotes the Lord on divorce, cf. especially vv. 12, 25 and 40. In 1 Corinthians 9 : 14, he quotes the Lord on the support of preachers of the Gospel, and in 1 Corinthians 11 : 23, he quotes the tradition of the institution of the Lord's Supper. 1 Corinthians 14 : 37 makes the statement that the preceding injunctions of the apostle concerning good order in church meetings are the commandment of the Lord, but this is not a direct quotation, neither is 1 Thessalonians 4 : 15 with reference to the resur-

rection. To be sure, James occasionally uses the words of the Sermon on the Mount, but he does not refer them to Jesus. First Peter once quotes words of Jesus in John in the same way. In Paul's speech to the elders at Miletus, Acts 20 : 35, he bids them to remember the words of the Lord Jesus how he said, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." These eight instances, only four of them direct quotations, are all which I find in the 163 pages of my American Revised version from Acts 1 to Revelation 22. When we consider the further facts about to be mentioned, we shall not be surprised that the Great Commission is not quoted or referred to, except possibly in Revelation 14 : 6, where the seer speaks of proclaiming the eternal gospel unto them that dwell upon the earth and unto every nation and tribe and tongue and people.

2. The second astonishing fact is that a careful study of the New Testament outside of the Gospels reveals little or no discussion of the missionary motive or of missionary principles, and no exhortation to missionary or evangelistic activity. As this fact has never to my knowledge been the subject of investigation, I beg your attention to a brief discussion of it.

Of course, the Acts tells the story of the missionary movement of early Christianity, first in Judea and Samaria, culminating in the story of the greatest missionary of our religion, the apostle Paul. Indeed apostle means missionary. But though we may deduce missionary motives and principles from this history, the Acts contains no discussion of them nor any exhortation to missionary endeavor.

In his epistles, Paul always writes with his missionary life immediately behind his words. The eager aggressive spirit of the great evangelist breathes through all his writings. He often describes the manner and motives of his coming to the particular church addressed. He tells us the story of his feelings and purposes as he entered Thessalonica in the wonderfully tender and revealing second chapter of his first letter. In 1 Corinthians 2 : 1-5, he tells us how he came to

Corinth in weakness and fear and much trembling, determined to preach in that Græco-Roman Chicago nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified. In Romans 1 and 15, he describes the reasons and feelings which impel him toward Rome. In 2 Corinthians 11 : 23-32, he recites the eloquent catalogue of his missionary trials. In 1 Corinthians 9 : 16-22, and 2 Corinthians 5 : 17-20, he shows his missionary motives and zeal in a more general, but not less moving way. And in many other passages more briefly he refers to his own missionary life and purpose. (2 Cor. 10 : 16-18; 11 : 7-9; Rom. 1 : 5, 14, 15; 15 : 8-12, 19-28, etc.)

He wants his disciples to pray for him and the success of his missionary endeavors. (2 Thess. 3 : 1; Col. 4 : 3, 4; Eph. 6 : 19, 20.) He sometimes speaks of the missionary activity of his churches, but in a very general and almost veiled way. In 1 Thessalonians 1 : 7-10, he tells the Thessalonian Christians that they have become an example to all who believe in Macedonia and Achaia; " for from you has sounded forth the word of the Lord not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but in every place we go, we do not need to tell of your conversion, for it is already known and everywhere talked about." Whether this indicates a missionary activity of the Thessalonians is very doubtful. Rather the report of their conversion has wonderfully heartened believers everywhere, the story is on every Christian lip. Similarly he tells the Romans, 1 : 8, that their faith is proclaimed throughout the world. Colossians 1 : 6, 7, which is on the same lines, seems to confirm our interpretation. However, Philippians 1 : 12-17 clearly describes missionary activity of the Roman Church in the capital itself, but whether first stirred to life by Paul's coming to Rome, or a revival of an earlier movement is not clear. Historically doubtless the latter.

The whole interest of the epistles is in the Christian community as such, in its fellowship with Christ and God, in its unity, in its maintenance of faith and hope, in its power to

resist temptation and persecution, in standing and holding fast. A rereading of the letters from this point of view shows that the thought moves almost entirely in this narrow sphere, is peculiarly internal and defensive. What more natural in these little groups of believers in a vast, hostile, and persecuting world?

But what are and what should be their relations to this great outside world of men? The epistles say very little indeed on that point, but they do say something. In Galatians 6 : 10, Paul bids to do good to all men, but adds " especially to those who are of the household of faith." Both Paul and Peter inculcate respect for government and its authority. (Rom. 13; 1 Peter 2 : 13-17; 1 Tim. 2 : 1-4.) The good opinion of the outside world is considered a matter of importance. In 1 Corinthians 14 : 23, Paul expresses the fear that the disorder of their meetings caused by the ecstatic speaking with tongues may make some unbeliever present think them crazy. In 1 Timothy 3 : 7, a bishop must have a good reputation with outsiders, and in 6 : 1, Christian slaves must honor their masters lest the name of God and the Christian teaching be blasphemed. In 1 Peter 3 : 16, 17 and 2 : 12, their good manner of life must put to shame their revilers.

But is nothing said about the duty of the early Christians to evangelize the great unconverted world? Very little and that mostly indirect.

The duty of rescuing backsliders is enforced in various ways in four passages, 2 Timothy 2 : 25, 26; James 5 : 19, 20; Jude 22, 23; and 1 John 5 : 16; but backsliders are not the outside world. In Romans 10 : 14, 15, in an argument to prove that the Jews are responsible for their own unbelief and rejection, he says that men cannot believe without a preacher and cannot preach unless they are sent. But this is very indirect and incidental. In 1 Timothy 2 : 4, we have the perfectly general statement that God our Saviour would have all men to be saved and come to a knowledge of the truth. In

Ephesians 5 : 11, Paul exhorts his readers to have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather even reprove them. The exhortation in 2 Timothy 4 : 2 to preach the word probably refers to preaching to recalcitrant Christians. Hebrews 5 : 12, tells the readers that it is high time they were teachers rather than taught; yet this probably means teachers of Christians. On the other hand the apostles and evangelists mentioned in Ephesians 4 : 11 and elsewhere are missionaries to the heathen. Probably the exhortation to Timothy (2 Tim. 1 : 8) not to be ashamed of the testimony of our Lord refers to boldness in preaching to the outside world, though that is not certain. And it can hardly be called an exhortation when in 1 Peter 3 : 15, the readers are mildly advised " to be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you concerning the hope that is in you." More direct references to personal evangelism and missionary activity on the part of Paul's converts and early Christians generally are very few. In 1 Corinthians 7 : 16, while advising mixed couples to continue to live together, if possible, Paul urges on them the consideration that by doing so the Christian husband or wife may save the unbelieving partner. In Philippians 1 : 5, Paul thanks God " for the fellowship of the Philippians in the furtherance of the gospel from the first day until now," but this general phrase probably includes much more than evangelism, if indeed it refers to it at all. In Philippians 2 : 15, 16, in a subordinate clause Paul refers to the Philippian Christians as lights in the world, holding forth the word of life. The only other New Testament book which bears testimony is the Revelation. Chapter XI deals with God's two witnesses, who represent in some sense the Christian Church and its testimony to a hostile world. In 12 : 11, it is said that the saints overcome the great dragon because of the word of their testimony; yet this seems to be their testimony in martyrdom, for it is immediately added, " they loved not their life even unto the death." In 22 : 17 where " The

Spirit and the Bride say, Come," the Bride is the church and the " Come " is the gospel invitation " to take the water of life freely." Revelation 14 : 16 has already been mentioned as a possible reminiscence of the Great Commission.

And this is all. Not a single paragraph of discussion of missionary motives or principles, not a single earnest exhortation to engage in personal evangelism or to organize missionary effort. Simply incidental and mostly vague references to such activities, that is all.

What then becomes of the argument against the Great Commission that it is never used as the basis of missionary argument or missionary appeal, when there is no missionary argument and no missionary appeal in the New Testament outside the Gospels? And when to this is added the fact of the meagerness of the appeal to Christ's words or commands on any subject, this objection to the authenticity of the Great Commission absolutely disappears.

Although it hardly belongs to our task, we may briefly inquire the reason of this strange fact of the absence of missionary appeal and exhortation to personal evangelism in the epistles. It is at first almost disconcerting, especially when we remember that fully one-half the epistles are exhortation in a hundred different directions. Is the modern church on the wrong track in its insistence on propaganda, personal and collective? Not at all. Let us study briefly the most typical passage for our problem—Paul's speech to the Ephesian elders at Miletus, Acts 20 : 17-38. Here Paul recounts to the elders the history of his missionary work in Ephesus and his efforts in personal evangelism, how he had taught them publicly and from house to house, testifying both to Jews and to Greeks repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ, how his whole life is a series of persecutions, but that nevertheless " I hold not my life as of any account as dear unto myself so that I may accomplish my course and the ministry which I received from the Lord Jesus, to testify

the gospel of the grace of God." Does Paul then proceed to exhort them to follow his example and set the church to the task of personal evangelism? No. He exhorts the elders to take heed to themselves and to the flock, to feed the church, to beware of heresies and divisions, and to help the weak and poor Christians. His prayer for them is that "God would build them up and give them an inheritance among all them that are sanctified." Not a word about their duty of propaganda. Yet in no passage does he draw a more vivid and striking picture of his own indefatigable evangelistic zeal or the missionary passion of his own career. But he does this because his purpose in the whole speech is to lay bare the purity of his motives, the unselfishness of his whole life among them, his entire freedom from self-seeking and covetousness and men-pleasing, his whole-hearted love for them. Why does he not urge them to follow his example in evangelism? and why does he not elsewhere expound to his disciples the missionary enterprise and lay its burden upon them? The answer to my mind is twofold: 1. Because it was unnecessary. The whole early church was filled with evangelistic fervor. Like Peter and John, they could not but speak the things which they had experienced. (Acts 4 : 19.) Jesus had made the apostles fishers of men. He took them on his evangelistic tours. Month after month they accompanied him and learned from the greatest of all missionaries the secret of his zeal. And this they propagated to their disciples. They gave to their hearers a religion of such intensity that it was not only self-sustaining but instinctively self-propagating. The churches needed to be founded and grounded in Christ, in love, in faith, to be exhorted to unity, to be taught how to live together, but the missionary passion was a living fire, which did not need to be fanned. It is everywhere taken for granted, but never urged or discussed. The proof of this is (1) that, if there had been necessity for such exhortation, Paul who was himself afire with the missionary passion, could not have failed

to preach this elementary duty on every fitting occasion; (2) that the New Testament constantly testifies the rapid spread of the gospel from the centers in which it was planted by Jesus and the apostles, and history tells us that soon the whole Roman Empire was ablaze with the new religion. This could never have happened unless, as in all new and vigorous religious movements, every Christian had been a missionary. We have a contemporary example in Christian Science, which is markedly propagandist. But in all the large amount of Christian Science literature which I have read, I do not recollect a single exhortation to propagate it. When this begins to appear, it will be a sign that the initial enthusiasm is beginning to cool.

The other reason for lack of missionary exhortation was the hostility of the great evil world and the persecution which constantly threatened. In such a world, Christians must learn "to walk in wisdom toward those that are without," seizing each opportunity, but graciously and sensibly as Paul says (Col. 4 : 5, 6). A church on fire with missionary zeal might easily destroy itself by kindling against itself the fires of persecution. Paul could not bear to restrain such a church, but he did not egg it on.

We have clearly explained why the Great Commission is never mentioned as the basis of missionary argument or appeal. It is now our duty to consider the final historical objection that the subsequent missionary development seems to ignore the Great Commission or indeed to make its authenticity incredible.

Here, first or all, we need to make a clear distinction between the Gentile mission and the Judaistic controversy. Neither the contemporary Jews nor the apostles nor the early Jewish Christians had any doubt or hesitation about a Gentile mission, but many Jewish Christians honestly believed that a Gentile must become a Jew, i. e., he must be circumcised and keep the law of Moses before he could become a Christian. They felt that Christianity, far from being an abandonment of Judaism, was the flower and completion of it. So they still

worshiped in the temple, circumcised their children, and observed the laws of clean and unclean, especially with reference to the Gentiles.

That the idea of a Gentile mission was a commonplace in Judaism, especially Messianic Judaism, is abundantly proved by three considerations: (1) The Old Testament is full of predictions of the conversion of the Gentiles. This is especially true of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Daniel, three of the favorite books of the New Testament age; (2) those who believed in the coming of a political Messiah believed that he would conquer and finally reign over all nations; (3) the Pharisees of Jesus' time carried on active propaganda among the Gentiles, and had many converts. Jesus himself refers to their compassing sea and land to make one proselyte. The early disciples of Jesus, of course, believed in the conversion of the Gentiles like their coreligionists, but they thought that the Gentiles must first become Jews in order to become Christians. Jesus had never had reason for discussing this latter subject and had never pronounced on it. The whole tenor of his life and teaching, however, prove that he would have taken the liberal view of Paul on the controversy, if it had ever presented itself. The Great Commission therefore was no surprise to the Jewish disciples of Jesus. It was the Old Testament prophecy now crystallized in Marching Orders. It had been prepared for by the tireless and thorough evangelistic tours of Jesus, in which his disciples had participated and it was understood by them in their own sense.

Now there can be no doubt that the Christian Church of Pentecost originated in Jerusalem. If we are to credit Luke, and we do, there had been directions of Jesus to begin in the Holy City. This transfer of the center of the new religion from Galilee to Jerusalem was most significant and was big with results. The freer air of Galilee was abandoned just as the liberalizing presence of Jesus was withdrawn. Jerusalem was legalistic, ecclesiastical, formal, intensely Jewish. The

new converts of the first days, who remained in Jerusalem and exerted influence, were mostly Judeans and Pharisees. The Galilean contingent with the Twelve at the center easily slipped back from the liberalism of Jesus and soon became fair legalists again. The proof of this is that we hear no more of the opposition of the Scribes and Pharisees so prominent in Jesus' ministry. Indeed, it is the Sadducees who are the first persecutors: the Pharisees sit back and let the Christians trouble the Sadducees without protest. In fact, in one early crisis, the Pharisee Gamaliel becomes their helper and rescues them from very imminent peril. All this confirmed the Jerusalem church in the idea that Gentiles must become Jews to become Christians. Pharisaic opposition did not flare up again till Stephen's revival of the liberalism of Jesus set fire to the persecuting zeal of the discerning Saul. It must be admitted freely that during this time the Great Commission was ignored, but, in their own minds the apostles were "beginning at Jerusalem." While this statement is true, it may give a false impression. The Great Commission did not stand out to them as it does to us on account of its position at the climax of the First Gospel. As we have shown there was nothing new or startling about it to them. It was in line with their traditional ideas derived from the Old Testament, reenforced by their experience of evangelistic work with Jesus, and by the whole impression of his spirit. Possibly it is not too much to say that without it the subsequent history would have been much the same.

The distinction between the Gentile mission and the Judaistic controversy solves the problem of Peter and Cornelius. Peter does not object to preaching the Gospel to the Gentile Cornelius. He does object to defiling himself by entering a Gentile's house. There is the bar of ceremonial and race prejudice between Peter and Cornelius, as between all Jewish Christians and Gentiles at that time, which must be broken down if all are to be one in Christ. So the vision and its lesson

are an absolute necessity, " Call no man common or unclean " (Acts 10 : 28). Peter, according to the Old Testament view had thought of Cornelius coming to him, or of his meeting the Gentile on common ground at least, and of the centurion becoming a proselyte before baptism, but all this was revised in the divine order, and the Spirit falls on these Gentiles while Peter yet speaks. Peter has learned much since three days ago. If the Spirit of Christ falls on these Gentiles, they are Christians, and Peter asks, " Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Spirit as well as we? "

When Peter on returning to Jerusalem is taken to task for his breaking of Jewish customs, not for preaching the gospel to Gentiles, he makes this detailed explanation, and his fellow Christians exclaim, " Then to the Gentiles also hath God granted repentance unto life," i. e., without requiring that they become Jews first. There is nothing here to prove that these men had never heard of a Gentile mission, and therefore of the Great Commission. As readers of the Old Testament, they had been perfectly familiar with the idea of the conversion of the Gentiles from childhood. What was new to them was that the Gentiles receive the new life from God directly without having to cross the bridge to Judaism first.

Paul's case at the Conference at Jerusalem in Acts XV is exactly parallel. The Jewish Christians did not object to Paul's preaching to the Gentiles, but they said, " It is needful to circumcise them and to charge them to keep the law of Moses " (Acts 15 : 1, 5). This was the nub of the whole controversy. There was no question which involved the Great Commission, whose general terms did not bear on the point which was up for decision, and there would have been no fitness in quoting it, even if it had been in mind.

The missionary commission thus stands firm, but its middle clause, which commands baptism into the Threefold Name, bears the brunt of a special battle, and is thought by some

scholars seriously to compromise the whole. But even if the baptismal clause is a later insertion, that fact seems to me by no means necessarily to vitiate the authenticity of the purely missionary part of the commission, so strong is the evidence for it.

[TO BE CONCLUDED]

ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND CRITICAL NOTES

THE University of Pennsylvania has for many years been foremost among American schools in forwarding archæological research, especially in the Orient. Besides the eminent men who are still making their contributions to this field of scholarship in this university, one recalls such investigators as Peters, Hilprecht, and Clay who in the past there enriched archæological learning. The QUARTERLY has already given some intimation of the work of Dr. Edward Chiera, who recently returned from an expedition in the region of Bagdad, and we hope later to give our readers some of the interesting results of finds of that enterprise.

Dr. Leon Legrain, curator of the Babylonian section of the University of Pennsylvania Museum, left early this season to join Dr. Leonard Wooley, director of the Babylonian expedition conducted jointly by the British Museum and the University of Pennsylvania Museum. Digging will be continued in Mesopotamia, to discover, if possible, the home and tombs of the kings. Last year the expedition unearthed in the northwest portion of the buried city a brick tower erected by King Ur-Nammu about the year 2400 B. C. There was also found the shrine of the moon-god Sin, which is dated about 1500 B. C.

Mr. Alan Rowe, field director of an expedition from the University of Pennsylvania working at Beisan in Palestine, has also lately reported interesting discoveries. Beisan is the ancient city of Bethshan of the Bible (1 Sam. 31 : 10), at which place, as it is said, of the defeated and slain King Saul: "They put his armor in the house of Ashtaroth; and they fastened his body to the wall of Bethshan." Doctor Rowe thinks he has unearthed this very temple of Ashtaroth found thirty-five feet below the surface, and also an image of the goddess

herself, with many other objects pertaining to her cult, such as bronze serpents and doves. Many interesting evidences of the Egyptian occupation of this region of Palestine about the twelfth century B. C. have been uncovered. The excavators surmise they may yet actually unearth the armor of Saul. But this is only a surmise. Stranger things have happened, however, in the fascinating romance of buried cities.

The death of Professor Albert T. Clay has impoverished the field of Oriental scholarship. His patient researches in cuneiform decipherment, his diligence in studying many hundreds of proper names that throw light upon the historical significance of the cuneiform literature, gave him high place among workers in that field. Doctor Clay, once professor in the University of Pennsylvania, was often heard in Chester and also at Crozer Seminary. One of his latest articles, if not the very last, was in reply to Prof. George A. Barton on a subject to which Doctor Clay had given much attention in his books. Professor Clay's studies had led him to believe that the Amorites were a much more important people than had been generally supposed, and that they, and not the Babylonians, were the source of the traditions and the civilization of the Hebrews.

The vicissitudes of Bible translators are no doubt many and sometimes harassing. The man who gets out a new version has not only to contend with conservatism which always "likes the old better," with the scholar who thinks another reading of the text or another rendering of it would be more accurate, and with the ignorant man who expresses his opinion without knowing the facts; but after all his work is finally completed, he may find that something has gone wrong in the typesetting and the proof-reading. We have not consulted the translators themselves, but we feel very sure that Doctor Moffatt did not translate the word *κέρατα* (horns) in Revela-

tion 5 : 6 by the word "heads," and yet here it is in the edition of his New Testament that is before us. There is no textual evidence that κέρατα should read κεφαλάς (heads) for which it might possibly have been mistaken by a copyist; nor is "horns" ever used in Scripture by synechdoche for "heads," but rather metaphorically to signify aggressive, courageous strength. We conclude "heads" is simply a misprint, and the passage should read, "It (the Lamb) seemed to have been slain, but it had seven horns, and seven eyes."

Equally confident is the present critic that Prof. Edgar J. Goodspeed, in his New Testament, did not intend to say in John 7 : 22, "Moses gave you the *right* of circumcision," but "the *rite* of circumcision." While neither "right" nor "rite" is expressly in the text, yet since the definite article is used with περιτομήν (circumcision), it would be quite right to translate it "the rite of," etc; but quite wrong to translate it "right." Doctor Moffatt renders it "the rite of circumcision." The latter, by the way, takes the liberty, which Doctor Goodspeed does not, of restoring this entire passage (7 : 15-24) "to its original place in the Gospel," that is, after verse 47, in Chapter 5. The transposition certainly makes both chapters more connected reading. Doctor Moffatt does not hesitate to make such transpositions when they seem to him necessary, as he does in a number of cases—notably in the Fourth Gospel, where no fewer than eight such cases of replacement are made by the translator.

NOTES AND CURRENT DISCUSSIONS

ON LETTING THE BIBLE ALONE

"WHY not let the Bible alone?" is a remark not infrequently heard today. It sometimes comes from the pen of a secular editor. It usually proceeds from some superficial observer who has heard of the appearance of a new version of the Scriptures, or perhaps of some suggested emendation of an obscure text, or, it may be, of an effort to reinterpret some passage in the light of clearer knowledge. The concern for the Scriptures, shown by those who insist that the Bible be "let alone," is too often the interest of those who really do let the Bible severely alone, except when they fancy it is being attacked, and then they become ready champions of the sacred book. We may admire any sincere effort to stand for the real integrity of the Scriptures; but defense of them by those who seldom, or never, study them, and are unfamiliar with the textual, linguistic, and historical problems involved, becomes a liability rather than an asset.

The Bible is a book which, from its very nature and history, cannot, and will not allow itself to be let alone. It has so entered into the life and literature of the modern world; holds so unique a place in the religious progress of mankind; claims so much, and has had so much more claimed for it, that its challenge is compelling. It simply will not be let alone. Each new age will insist upon having the message in its own tongue; and men will insist in weighing the Bible values afresh. It is certain no gold will be lost.

We give our readers the following communication, which discusses an old question, of present interest. It illustrates from one view-point, why the Bible will not be "let alone," and can not be let alone.

The Meaning of the Creative Day in Genesis

Before the modern scientific age began to question the Genesis account of creation it was generally accepted at its face value. God called the material universe into being out of nothing, and by a series of acts continuing through six successive days organized it, filling it with life and activity, and set it going much as it has continued ever since. The scientific world is no longer able to accept the literal truth of the Biblical account as it relates to the physical universe, and most scientists frankly reject it. It is, of course, not the place of natural science to reconcile the Bible with its findings, nor to hold any theory at all on the subject of Biblical trustworthiness. If a natural scientist attempts any such thing he is acting not in his capacity of scientist but as a theologian; and it is quite possible for a physical scientist to be also a theologian. But many theologians, being unable intellectually to reject the findings of science, have felt it incumbent upon them to reinterpret the Genesis account of creation in order at once to bring it into harmony with science and save its credibility and the infallibility of its author. In pursuit of this end they have arrived at some such conclusion as the following. The order of creation in Genesis accords remarkably with the order suggested in the theory of evolution. We have in each case, first a chaotic period, then the division of light and darkness, then the separation of land and water, the appearance of plant life and finally of animal life. It is interesting that the Genesis account represents man as having been formed on the same creative day as the rest of the higher animal kingdom. The seven days of the week of creation are taken to have been seven ages, emphasis being laid on the fact that the Hebrew word translated " day " is frequently used for an indefinite period of time.

Now there are several objections to this method of procedure. Attempts to harmonize apparently irreconcilable contradictions and to explain insuperable difficulties are always dangerous. They are likely to lead to intellectual dishonesty and to result in logical absurdities. The valiant defenders of the literal historical accuracy of the creation story in Genesis are compelled to blink stolidly at certain glaring inconsistencies and impossibilities. In fact, an unprejudiced candor is bound to confess that, irrespective of what we may think of the success or failure of modern science in giving a better explanation of the natural universe, the Genesis account is scientifically impossible. It bears all the earmarks of primitive conceptions. Only the crudest ignorance and simplicity, or the blindest prejudice, could accept it as in any sense historical.

That the first account is in the main somewhat logically arranged,

following a reasonable order of origins, bears testimony to the intellectuality and seriousness of the author; but it affords no reason for crediting him with a knowledge of scientific theories evolved millenniums after his death; nor can it disguise the fact that his conceptions were those of the primitive age in which he lived. It is quite a queer idea of the illuminating power of the revealing Spirit to conceive of it as imparting to the inspired author a knowledge of scientific facts hidden from the world for yet millenniums while it allowed him to stumble into such incongruities as the statement that the celestial lights were formed and set in the firmament, for the marking of days and seasons, after vegetation was in full development, and after there had already been three days. One is reminded of the answer of the Negro school-teacher to the little pupil who inquired why the sun is so much brighter than the moon. "Well, you see," was the reply, "it's dis way. De sun jes hafter shine in de daytime, but de moon, he hafter shine in de night when it's dark. Mebby ef de sun was ter tackle de moon's job he wouldn't do it near so well as de moon does."

In the account in the second chapter, of course, we run upon representations that the apologist usually sublimely ignores, having satisfied himself that he has discovered some subtle indication that the author was occultly in possession of the most modern scientific knowledge. But one can hardly discuss such opinions seriously.

It is in regard to the oft-repeated statement that the creative "day" signifies an eon that I wish to make a few remarks. One prominent apologist actually goes so far as to say that "it is significant" that the word used means an indefinite period of time. Such a statement is wholly misleading. One would gather from it that the writer of Genesis would naturally have used some other and more exact word for "day," but purposely chose this ambiguous word to preserve the twentieth century scientific accuracy of his account without letting the scientific cat out of the bag to his contemporary readers. As a matter of fact, it is the only word he had for his immediate purpose, therefore there can be nothing "significant" in his using it.

The Hebrew word is exactly equivalent to the English word, even in the respect that it may signify either a period of twenty-four hours or the period of daylight as opposed to night. Unless the context makes it clear that it indicates a longer period it must necessarily have one of these two meanings; and if the writer of Genesis used it in the Genesis account of creation in the more general sense he was as guilty of misrepresentation as if he had used a word incapable of that sense. No reader but the desperate apologist would ever have thought of so interpreting it.

If I should say that I had spent three days in Philadelphia, meaning three periods of ten years each, I should certainly be guilty of misleading my readers; yet it is quite permissible in English to say "In Cæsar's day" and "In this day and generation."

But the author of Genesis, or Providence, as if to make assurance doubly sure and to confound the poor apologist, particularly specifies just in what sense the word is to be taken. I am more tempted to discover a miraculous prescience in this apparent precaution than in the indications of scientific information afforded by the text. The creative day, we are told, consisted of evening (ערב) and morning (בקר). There can be no shadow of doubt about the meaning of the interesting formula, ויהי ערב ויהי בקר יום אחד. It means that the day consisted of a period of darkness and a period of light, that is, it was a twenty-four hour day; and no one can dispute the scientific accuracy of this description. I am inclined to think that ערב and בקר are used here synecdochically for לילה and יום. "It became evening" means practically the same thing as "It became night." יום being used in the context for the whole night-day period, בקר is naturedly used for the daylight period, and ערב is its natural correlative. But it is quite possible that the author chose the words for a descriptive narrative, as more descriptive. Just what the original meaning of יום and לילה were we do not know, and perhaps the author of Genesis did not. They are simply appellatives, while ערב and בקר are descriptive. ערב means "darkness," בקר, "light"—literally a rift or cleft in the darkness. But however we may account for their use in the passage under consideration, there can be no question about the meaning of the phrase as a whole. It could not possibly describe an eon.

JOHN MONCURE.

Mr. Moncure makes it clear that one is really no true friend of the Scriptures who, in an effort to make it cover all modern knowledge, renders it an impossible or a false witness to all preceding ages. Certainly no ancient Hebrew, who always began his day with the evening and ended it with morning, would have thought the writer of the first chapter of Genesis could have meant anything else than an ordinary day (of twenty-four hours) by the expression, "It was evening, and it was morning, first day." An indefinite era, with an evening followed by a morning, would surely not have entered his head. Those who wish to harmonize the Bible with mod-

ern science in this matter generally overlook the fact that if the word "day" means an indefinite stretch of time here, it must be so rendered throughout the entire account. If God created the earth and all that is in it in long eons, "he rested on the seventh eon . . . and blessed the seventh eon and hallowed it" (2 : 2, 3). Has the world of interpreters been wrong in supposing that the sabbath day was to be a rest day of twenty-four hours, one day in seven?

Is it not very much wiser, and more in accord with the facts, to say that in matters pertaining to the physical universe, the writers of Scripture were given no preternatural revelation, but that they spoke their spiritual revelations in terms of the common knowledge and common speech of their times? Scientific knowledge was for them unimportant. What men needed was spiritual guidance. This God gave through them, in marvelous measure. Had God revealed to them twentieth-century science, it would have been unintelligible to all others prior to our century, and antiquated to all who come after us. Had he gone into the business of revealing the physical universe in a book infallible in all its features, God would have been forced to give the pure and ultimate science. And what is that? Certainly a body of knowledge that would be confusing, baffling, and utterly useless to all the future ages of man's existence. God chose the wiser course of giving mankind a book of spiritual values, disclosing his redemptive purposes; helping man where he could not help himself; leaving disclosures of the physical world to experiment and investigation, which man might carry on to his mind's edification and his heart's content. God's great concern was, and is, that men "may know him, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom he hath sent." This, and this alone, is the purpose of the Book. And since everything is fairly evaluated by the purpose for which it was made, we may well regard the Bible as no exception. As a progressive revelation of God's redeeming love, it will always hold the supreme place.

SOME PHASES OF CURRENT PSYCHOLOGY

THE pen of the psychologist has fallen in divers places. Few ranges of investigation have escaped the search of this scientist. Plants, planets, animals, men, have been brought within his reach and submitted to critical behavioristic study. Nor has there been any effort for a uniform way of approach. The introspectionist, the extrovert, the personalist, the mechanician, the psychoanalyst, the nominalist, the collectivist, etc., have taken the field. They represent the prospectors of the pioneer science of social behavior. Despite the promiscuity of preamble and adventure, they are narrowing the bounds of prescientific notions and enlarging the service of trustworthy hypotheses in reference to the interactionary life of humans and things.

No professional man can afford to be negligent of findings in the field of psychology. The churchman, in particular, can blaze the trail of his Master only as he learns the laws of personality and community forces. The learning process may proceed unconsciously by fumble and success methods only, or by the assistance of advisory psychological technique. Out of an abundance of materials the writer has elected the following volumes to suggest some discoveries in this area of research which should be fruitful for the prophet and engineer of the Kingdom.

Floyd Henry Allport [1] has chosen the "behavior viewpoint" and the "experimental method" to account for the conduct of men. He pays his compliments to psychoanalysis and the "instinct" school and trusts his text will be serviceable to "all who are interested in the social adjustments of individuals and the broader problems of society."

This publication is perhaps the most important manual in recent years representing nominalistic psychology. The author makes short shrift of works based on "crowd mind," "group

[1] "Social Psychology." Houghton Mifflin Company. Boston. 1924. Pp. xiv, 453. $2.50.

thinking," "class consciousness," and the like, claiming "there is no psychology of groups which is not essentially and entirely a psychology of individuals." Social psychology is, then, "the science of the social behavior and social consciousness of the individual" (p. 382). For him the concept "group" is an arbitrary term without scientific value. This marked disparagement of "collective" psychology may or may not be merited, depending upon the view-point of the student. It may be that group thinking is more and different from the concurrent thinking of the members of the group.

Passing through an elective chapter on the physiological basis of behavior, Allport undertakes to analyze original human nature in terms of four fundamental categories: prepotent reflexes, habit formation, thought, emotion. The first category is his own term and represents "inborn foundations" of man. "Instinct" wears "a priori" apparel; "impulse" falls short in definitiveness. "Prepotent reflexes" are characterized as "the avoiding reactions" and the "approaching responses" of the human offspring. "The intricacies of human conduct arise as modifications of these simple prepotent responses" (p. 79).

For the churchman the most beneficial part of the work opens at chapter five when Allport considers "Personality—The Social Man" in terms of intellectual activities, "drives," moods, attitudes, socialization, and character-making. Such clear analysis of the function of motive as the following, elicits careful recognition:

> The greatest obstacle to clear insight (a phase of self-expression) is the tendency to act from one motive and to try to make ourselves (and others) believe that we are acting from another. The substituted, or rationalized, motive is one which "sounds better" to the social environment as reflected in our own consciences. In this way we comfort ourselves for our past offenses, and delude ourselves as to the ethical bearing of those which we are planning to commit. . . .
>
> Insight in the form of ability to see through one's rationalizations and defense attitudes is one of the strongest of social assets. He who can

judge his own traits for their true worth has no delusions of grandeur about himself. His self-evaluation is perfect (pp. 117, 118).

"Conversation of attitudes," to use the phrase of another psychologist, is as trenchant in social intercourse as language communication. The part of gesture in emotional, demonstrative, and graphic types of parley is most illuminatingly treated.

With infant speech, the single word "doll" may denote tenderness for the object, meditation about it, or an angry desire to have it for the shelf, according to the tone with which it is pronounced and the accompanying gestures (p. 192).

How can we understand the conduct of an individual?

It is not the direct emotional behavior of a person, so much as the knowledge of the conditions affecting him that makes it possible for us to understand (and indeed to sympathize) with his state of mind (pp. 234-5).

Some folks work persistently to build up a good reputation. They are adept advertisers. An approved social self is tantamount to success. This process Allport pictures in these words:

My idea of myself is largely my neighbor's idea of me, or rather my own idea of my neighbor's idea of me. To this we may add that "my idea of my neighbor's idea" is usually that which I *want* my neighbor to think; and hence may be an illusory social projection, a mental image rather than a reality. In this case the social self is the self which we wish and assume others to think we possess. The interrelation of social attitudes is thus both complex and vital. Attitudes of others toward us, whether real, supposed, or only wished, control both our self-consciousness and our personal conduct (p. 325).

The author lends considerable attention to personality factors involved in crowd and congregational groupings. Psychology throws light on how a minister "holds" his hearers, how an audience participates in shaping "social atmosphere," how moral sanctions are welded, and how such unorganized controls as convention, custom, public opinion, and the like,

and such institutional controls as government, education, and religion operate in social organization and direction. The closing chapter is rich in principle and application for those who court suggestion regarding the forces that make society. To each chapter is appended a thorough bibliography covering wide ranges of research.

Eduard C. Lindeman [2] has interested himself in the problem of methodology as the social worker sees it. He exercises "undaunted faith in the possibilities of applying scientific methods to the study of human nature in its collective aspects," and consequently ever improving technique in the direction of social behavior. His "tentative conclusions" he trusts may be a "slight contribution" to the nascent science of "collective" psychology.

Science as "perpetual tentativeness" addresses itself to "solving some specific problem." There is no room for subjective dogmatism or unqualifiable induction. Logic has limitations. Its assumptions are true "not because they are used in logic but because they are empirically true." Formal logic is an untenable discipline from the author's point of view.

> The so-called universal rules of logic which are the foundations of most major premises do not exist in the sphere of human affairs, if indeed they exist at all. . . . If universals . . . have any integrity at all, it is because they represent the accumulative evidence, as inductions, of every case within the type (p. 79).

Having treated critically the values and limitations of such social methods as the historical, the logical, the analogical, and the statistical, Lindeman turns in Part II of the manual to an extensive investigation of the method of "social discovery." The major premise of his thesis may be gathered succinctly from this quotation:

> Sociologists have been for long periods engaged upon the task of describing society, but there is no society; there are only societies, and

[2] "Social Discovery, An Approach to the Study of Functional Groups." Republic Publishing Company. New York. 1924. Pp. xx, 375. $1.00.

these societies are somehow the sum total of numerous constituent groups. The central question then becomes, What is man as a member of a group, or groups? Man as an individual is an abstraction to the social scientist. The attributes of man which are the object of his study are those attributes which inhere in and express themselves through group relations. Man in relation to other men is the sphere of social science. The problem is to discover the nature and the meaning of this relationship.

Human beings in relation are human beings behaving; or sociology is the science of collective behavior. Collective behavior is social process: the activities which transpire between individuals as members of groups and the activities which may be indicated as active relations between groups (pp. 20, 21).

Is the work of the social scientist to remain purely subjective? Can he penetrate within individual and group to diagnose motive, attitude, and control?

A full understanding of what happens will perhaps forever escape the knowledge of man; regions of the "mind" and its functioning in behavior may exist which subjective terms only can explain, but the area of subjectivism has been diminished in other spheres, and there are no reasons to expect its diminution to stop (p. 116).

The task of rearing a sound science is often deterred by

(a) the tendency to describe the group in terms of mystical entities and (b) the tendency to utilize non-sociological categories in describing the group's processes (p. 354).

Lindeman is not oblivious of the "language" problem.

The conceiving and arranging of knowledge categories is a perilous task. The language difficulty presents itself at the outset as one of the predominant obstacles. . . . Concepts are overlaid with emotions which produce perplexing overtones and undertones. The same word does not carry the same meaning to all persons; nor does it carry the same meaning to the same person under varying conditions and at varying times. . . . The written word is far more likely to be misunderstood than the spoken word. Language is qualitative. Words, so far from being the vehicles to understanding, lead themselves to purposive misunderstanding. The essence of a complete controversy may be lost sight of by the mere use of a question-begging term or an epithet. Words are figurative, sym-

bolic. . . . and hence must be defined, redefined and *re*fined. . . . the present is a decidedly unappropriate time for being dogmatic about definitions (pp. 158-161).

Regard for subtle difficulties does not unnerve the psychologist. He proceeds to analyze the factors involved in the social process of group interactions and relate them by means of the tools of his science. Whence Lindeman deduces his fifteen "postulates of empirical social theory" (pp. 360-363). It is interesting to note that where Allport adopts the "individual" as the key to social psychology, Lindeman chooses the "group."

What is the meaning of meaning?[3] Language is universal and serves a ready instrument of social intercourse. But what is language? Is it an unerring device of communication, or is it subject to flaw and frequently to futility? Linguists have struggled long to give man a science of language. Ogden and Richards maintain that their field is too circumspect to provide a sufficiently critical approach to the question. The psychologist, the anthropologist, and the philosopher must also take entrée and assist in the project.

The authors have introduced to scholarship a science of symbolism of far-reaching import. This text is a foundational study for all who would take seriously the subject of language function. The book has triple purpose: to present historically the findings of men from Plato to Pierce and Dewey, to evaluate their positions in the light of recent psychological discoveries, and to shape a theory of "meaning of meaning."

The work is somewhat heavy, the materials sometimes discursive, and collateral readings abundant. To study the text considerable patience is required. An admirable illustration of the author's thesis is to be found in the supplements. One, "The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages," by Bronislaw Malinowski, and the other, "The Importance of a

[3] "The Meaning of Meaning, A Study of the Influence of Language upon Thought and of the Science of Symbolism." C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards. Harcourt, Brace and Company. N. Y. 1923. Pp. xxxii, 554. $3.75.

Theory of Signs and a Critique of Language in the Study of Medicine," by F. G. Crookshank. These essays might well be read as an introduction to the main work. A good summary of the authors' position is found on pages 382-391. The science of symbolism points to a limited value of language under any circumstances, to humanistic factors involved in all verbal intercourse, and to the joining of the problems of epistemology and the psychology of language.

Words are symbols only, and have no substantial existence *per se*. Formal logic smacks of superficialism. " The proposition as a separate entity is to be regarded as nothing but a linguistic fiction foisted upon us by the utraquistic subterfuge " (p. 168). All men are in danger of such subtle misuse of language as logolatry, logocracy, verbal magic, hypostatization of verbal entities, verbomania, utraquism. Such universals as Democracy, Religion, Righteousness, etc., are without meaning unless utilized as contracted symbols referring to more expanded symbols, the latter representing the findings of experimental science.

The clear realization of the intimate connection between linguistic interpretation and the analysis of the culture to which the language belongs, show convincingly that neither a Word nor its Meaning has an independent and self-sufficient existence. The Ethnographic view of language proves the principle of Symbolic Relativity as it might be called, that is, that words must be treated only as symbols and that *a psychology of symbolic reference must serve as the basis of all science of language*. Since the whole world of " things-to-be-expressed " changes with the level of culture, with geographical, social, and economic conditions, the consequence is that the meaning of a word must be always gathered, not from a passive contemplation of that word, but from an analysis of its functions, with reference to the given culture (p. 469).

Perhaps the following excerpt leads the reader directly to the heart of the authors' position and problem.

There are three factors involved when any statement is made, or interpreted: 1. Mental processes. 2. The symbol. 3. A referent—something that is thought " of."

The *theoretical* problem of Symbolism is, How are these three related? The *practical* problem, since we must use words in discussion and argument, is, How far is our discussion itself distorted by habitual attitudes toward words, and lingering assumptions due to theories no longer openly held but still allowed to guide our practice?

. . . Our interpretation of any sign is our psychological reaction to it, as determined by our past experience in similar situations and by our present experience.

F. C. S. Schiller has given readers "a little book on a big subject."[4] Like Ogden and Richards, his English coworkers, he has addressed himself to the subject of language, language as it takes form in religious belief.

So long as beliefs were the property of the Church, no serious problem emerged in respect of them. They were the product of speculative theology and deductive logic. When learning was liberated, men discovered that "the way to truth leads normally through error, doubt, and probability, and not through uncontradicted affirmation." When beliefs were seen as a quality of function of the whole personality, difficulties gathered. Beliefs are bones of contention between logic and psychology, and when carried to related, ultimate questions lead to metaphysical issues.

The superficiality of what passes for "logic" arises from neglect of psychology, which logicians have thought it possible to short-circuit. They supposed that they could determine the logical meaning of "propositions" without going into the infinite complexities of the psychological meaning a proposition might actually convey in suitable contexts; so they gaily abstracted from psychological meaning, without observing that they were thereby abstracting from real meaning, and dooming themselves to mere verbalism. Had they been willing to take into account the psychological side of thought and the real meaning of those who did the thinking, it is not credible that they should not have realized the futility of trying to determine the value (and even the validity!) of an argument, without ascertaining its meaning, purpose, and context, from a mere inspection of its verbal form (p. 98).

[4] "Problems of Belief." Ferdinand Canning Scott Schiller (Oxford). Hodder and Stoughton. London. 1925. Pp. viii, 194. $1.25.

Beliefs are not possessions of intellect as such. They have their rise in the creative crises of human behavior and represent activistic aspects of the complete person. They are offspring of men, not minds. As a Jamesian disciple, Schiller defines a belief as "a spiritual attitude of welcome which we assume toward what we take to be a 'truth'" (p. 14). The import of "spiritual" is not clear. There are three questions to be asked of any belief: How did it come to be (Psychology)? What is it worth (Logic)? and, How do origin and value affect each other (relating Logic and Psychology)?

Emotive elements enter into beliefs and constitute data which the logician cannot measure. This feeling factor clarifies men's interpretations of belief. Indeed, they may be seen as "implicit," "half," "debatable," "dishonest," "make," "pseudo," and "dis-" beliefs. There are also the additional phenomena of doubt, certainty, and skepticism. To each of these qualified subjects the author gives considerable analysis.

Speaking of half-beliefs, Schiller suggests that "the erroneous discrepancies between religious profession and practice" may be accounted for largely by the widely accepted vogue of this type of belief.

> That religions should be extensively infected with half-belief is a natural consequence of the great part played by authority in the transmission of religious belief, and of the prevalence of seasonal variation in the stimuli to religious emotion (p. 57).

What determines our beliefs? What are our norms? Truth, Goodness, or Beauty? There are no absolute standards known to man. Beliefs are empirically made and hence pluralistic. The final test is survival-value. They are doubtless compounded of varying degrees of truth, beauty, goodness, *and* pleasure. Men elect their system of truth when they are not compelled to pay allegiance to some authoritative creed. Schiller's election is Humanism.

STEWART G. COLE.

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

Professor Spenser B. Meeser is well known to the readers of the Quarterly. After a number of successful pastorates with strong churches, he became professor of Systematic Theology in Crozer Theological Seminary, which position he has held for seventeen years. The address, "The Apparent Conflict between Science and Religion," was delivered before a large audience on the evening of the matriculation exercises of the Seminary, on September 26, 1925.

Rev. W. T. Whitley, D. D., of Droitwich, England, has for many years given himself to historical research in addition to his labors as a minister. He has been, during the past year, lecturing in America, chiefly on historical subjects, and was heard at several of our Baptist Seminaries, among them, Crozer. In the article published in this issue of the Quarterly he has brought together material old and new which gives in clearer perspective the account of that interesting body of Christians who claim the apostle Thomas as their father in the gospel.

By a rather strange coincidence, the Rev. John Crosby, Baptist pastor at Glen Campbell, Pennsylvania, sent us a study he had made of a branch of these same "Saint Thomas Christians," that found their way to India and there made converts who developed a sect resembling, in many respects, the Baptists. Doctor Crosby was a Roman Catholic scholar and teacher, before uniting with the Baptists. His article and Doctor Whitley's read together will be found of unusual historical interest.

Dr. Barnard C. Taylor, onetime professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Interpretation in Crozer Seminary, is already well known to the readers of the Crozer Quarterly.

In this number Professor Taylor distinguishes, in his clean-cut manner of thinking, between the Old Testament prophets in their practice and method and the modern preacher, whose prophetic function is so frequently stressed in the discussions of the preaching of today.

Rev. Charles H. Day, D. D., of Newton Center, Massachusetts, furnishes us with the fourth article in a series upon great Baptist educational leaders of the past generation. He writes an appreciative appraisal of the life and work of his teacher, and the teacher of hundreds of our leading pastors and educators of today, President Alvah Hovey, for many years the head of Newton Theological Institution. The former articles in the series were that of Dr. B. C. Taylor on President Henry G. Weston, in the issue of January, 1925, that of Dr. E. C. Dargan on John A. Broadus, in the Quarterly of April, and that on Ebenezer Dodge by Charles Hastings, D. D., in the July number.

Professor Frederick L. Anderson is not a stranger to the Quarterly readers, for in last April's issue he discussed "The Value of a Scholarly Knowledge of the New Testament to an Evangelical Pastor." In this number he presents the first part of a careful study of the authenticity of "The Great Commission"—a subject which will at once be regarded as having a bearing upon a question which Northern Baptists are just now seriously considering. In some local churches the question of whether baptism should be insisted upon as a requirement for every one who is admitted to membership, has been raised; and an amendment to the By-laws of the Northern Baptist Convention is proposed (for settlement at the next session), which amendment will admit no representation from churches that have what is known as "open membership." The discussion therefore is timely. We regret the necessity of dividing Doctor Anderson's article. The second

part is reserved for the April number. It is probable our readers will desire to have the arguments that have been advanced against the authenticity of this verse in Matthew's Gospel presented. Professor Anderson has stated these with clarity and scholarly fairness, but from the nature of the case could not present all the considerations which enter into the opposite view. The reader will recognize that he has presented the arguments in favor of the authenticity of the words attributed to Jesus, with great cogency.

Reverend Professor John Moncure is a native of Virginia. He received his theological instruction at the Southern Baptist Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky. He has held pastorates in Virginia, South Carolina, and Maryland, and is now professor of Biblical History and Literature in the Maryland College for Women, Lutherville, Maryland.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Growth and Contents of the Old Testament. CHARLES FOSTER KENT. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons.

CHARLES FOSTER KENT, who has so recently passed from us, was one of the most untiring Old Testament students. When death claimed him, he had completed almost twenty-five years of service in Yale University as "Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature," and was the author of more than a score of important publications. He was one of the best-known, one of the most enthusiastic workers among the modern interpreters of the Bible. A happy interpreter of Scripture, he was always in great demand in pastors' conferences and conventions. He gave unstintedly and gladly of his energy both on the platform and in the press.

His work was always religious in the highest sense. True, he was interested in the results of the critical scholarship of the day and was familiar with the best work that was being done. But his chief interest was to mediate the religious values which he believed were revealed through the historical approach. His Old Testament histories, his interpretations, his Shorter Bible, his Student's Old Testament and other works have each made a contribution to the religious life of the country.

The last book to bear his name is titled "The Growth and Contents of the Old Testament." It is an introduction to the entire Old Testament. It has been compiled from the introductions to the various volumes of the Student's Old Testament, with an additional chapter which was to be the introduction to an unpublished volume of the series. To have all of these introductions in one volume is a great gain. It makes it possible for those who could not well purchase the seven volumes to possess these introductions to the whole of the Old Testament.

The titles to the seven chapters suggest the contents and in part the treatment. They are: The History of Israel's Early Records; The History of Israel's Historical and Biographical Narratives; The History of the Prophetic Sermons, Epistles, and Apocalypses; The History of Israel's Laws and Legal Precedents; The History of the Songs, Hymns, and Prayers; The History of the Wisdom Literature. The book is very readable, though packed full of information, and always constructive, though it ofttimes runs counter to traditional interpretations. Any one who seriously wishes to understand the present position, in general, of Old Testament scholarship can scarcely do better than to reread his Old Testament with the guidance of this introduction.

I. G. MATTHEWS.

The Religion of the People of Israel. Rudolf Kittel. Translation by R. Caryl Micklem. The Macmillan Company. 1925.

In few books of the same size is there more thought-provoking material in the field of Old Testament religion than in this volume. Doctor Kittel has been for more than a quarter of a century Professor at the University at Leipzig and has occupied a prominent place among the more conservative of the German scholars. Like so many of his confrères he has been a prodigious worker. His reputation is world-wide in the fields of textual, exegetical, and historical criticism. His *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* is among the invaluable works on the Old Testament of recent years. Thus a rich lore and a mature mind lie behind this publication.

This volume is a translation by R. Caryl Micklem of lectures delivered by Professor Kittel in the University of Upsala in 1920. In eight chapters, covering a little over two hundred pages, the author sketches the important currents in the religion of the people of Israel. A wealth of material is woven in cogent argument around the main thesis of the book. Religion has never been born *in vacuo,* and Israel was no exception to the rule. The origins and the ever-changing environment of the people must be taken into consideration to understand fully their moral and spiritual conceptions. Divine revelation has always been mediated by men, who have responded to forces that were playing upon them. Professor Kittel endeavors to estimate the influence of such forces on the Old Testament leaders. At the same time he never forgets the significance of the creative personality. His method is certainly correct.

In the first chapter he discusses the Canaanite background and influence more fully than is customary in brief treatises on the religion of Israel. This contributes to our appreciation of the moral and religious development of the later days as well as to the worth of the book. This background is very dark. It is primitive ritualistic, with ensuing orgies, and idolatrous. In the midst of this the Hebrews worked out their salvation.

The God of the Patriarchs is the title of the second chapter. Here the pre-Mosaic and the Mosaic religious conceptions are sketched. Moses is given an exalted position as Israel's creative genius in the realm of moral and spiritual values. Kittel considers the decalogue "a very natural groundwork for the ethical requirements upon which he built his ethical requirements." He believes also that the original stimulus to the Covenant Code came from Moses. In short with Moses the Yahweh-religion became a thoroughly ethical religion.

With the settlement in Canaan we are faced with the development of two religions, the lower or the popular, and the higher or the more truly Yahwistic. The first group was betrayed by the attractiveness of the Canaanite religion; the second, through reaction against the evil and assimilation of the good, gradually adapted the ethical and spiritual outlook of Moses to broadening horizons and growing needs. To the former belonged the false prophets; to the latter, the great prophets and their spiritual descendants.

The author finds a decidely retrograde movement following the time of Moses. He interprets Saul as an adherent of popular religion, to which belong the guilds of the prophets, the teraphim, etc., and considers his neglect of the ark an indication of his attitude toward Mosaic religion. David, on the other hand, while paying homage to the popular religion, actually was devoted to the higher. He forcibly depressed Canaanitish influences, restored the ark to its place of honor, and leaned toward the simplicity of worship and the ethical emphasis of Moses.

Thus runs the study through eight chapters, always clear, always suggestive. "The Great Prophets of the Assyrian Period"; "The Prophets of the Babylonian Period"; "The Persian Period," and "The Greek Period" are the titles to the successive chapters which bring the story down to practically the beginning of the New Testament period. Each chapter is well wrought out, with an abundance of references to Scripture in the foot-notes, and a wealth of learning in the background. With the translator we can say, "I hope this translation will prove to be of value to many students, and to other readers who may be interested in the subject."

I. G. MATTHEWS.

The History and Literature of the New Testament. HENRY THATCHER FOWLER, Ph. D., Professor of Biblical Literature and History in Brown University. New York. The Macmillan Company. 1925. Pp. 443. $2.50.

HERE is a book that challenges attention. Its title is ordinary enough, "The History and Literature of the New Testament," but its treatment is most uncommon. In some way or other Doctor Fowler has managed to tuck away in his pages about all the modern critical opinions and surmises. For example, the first two chapters are introductory and are intended to orient the reader. The former gives the most compact and convenient history of Palestine from the Maccabean revolt to the death of King Herod that the present reviewer knows. How Doctor Fowler has packed so much information into twenty pages is little short of marvelous. Every sentence bristles with facts, yet withal is as

fascinating as a novel. And this is true of the whole book. When speaking of the Gospel of Mark the author comments "We are given no time to take breath, and feel as though there were one behind us saying, 'Hurry, hurry'" (p. 307). How well this describes our book. The present reviewer was injudicious enough to pick it up in the early evening. Midnight found him reading, loath to lay it down unfinished.

Simply and without display the author reveals the divinely natural origin of our New Testament. Out of the history of the growing church its literature was evolved. As Henry Drummond finely wrote, "The Bible grew out of religion." Following this clue the various stages of the New Testament are seen. First, the dynamic work of Jesus. He left no written record; men filled by the power of his personality were his epistles. But as the church expanded practical needs made their insistent demand. To meet these needs the Christian writings came into existence; the letters of the great apostle, and perhaps collections of some of Jesus' sayings, the latter destined to find their grave within three decades in our Gospels Matthew and Luke. And similarly the other books. In the case of each he is at pains to show the probable situation and the particular need that called it forth.

The author strives to maintain at all times a complete and dispassioned impartiality. Occasionally, this endeavor leads him to oscillate between two conclusions until the reader is not quite sure which view the author feels more probable. But even this failing leans to virtue's side.

At least it is a joy to read a book whose author does not feel a heaven-imposed responsibility either to contend valiantly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints, or yet to convert the world to modernism, but is content to let his reader work out his own salvation in the light of all the evidence. Doctor Fowler has produced a book that may be confidently recommended not alone to the college students to whom it is primarily addressed, but to all those who seek more light on the classic of the ages. Its reading can scarcely fail to give fresh vitality to the study of the Book.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

Literature of the New Testament. HERBERT R. PURINTON, Professor of Biblical Literature and Religion in Bates College, and CARL EVERETT PURINTON, Fellow of the National Council on Religion in Higher Education. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1925. Pp. viii, 186. $1.25.

PROFESSOR PURINTON, of Bates College, in collaboration with his son has produced a companion volume to his Literature of the Old Testament. As in this former work he has had in mind chiefly the college student

who cannot be expected to have any systematic acquaintance with the subject. Accordingly he has endeavored to meet this need with a simple and fascinating discussion of the various books comprising our New Testament. The title might well have been chosen "The New Testament as Literature," for throughout the book he has been at pains to point out the tremendous debt that letters and art owe to these superb examples of the master writers. From his wealth of knowledge of English literature he has selected many illustrative passages both of prose and verse of the sections under discussion, not a few of which shed real light as well as add to the interest.

In his endeavor to make the characters in his pages stand out as real flesh and blood men it must be admitted he has drawn at times pretty heavily on imagination. And accordingly again and again we find sections introduced by such phrases as "We may imagine a scene in the house of Mary . . ." (p. 61), or "Yet in our imagination we are able to know him well" (p. 96), or "We may think of him," etc. (p. 117). Occasionally these glowing reconstructions bear about the same relation to the meager bits of recorded data as the pictures the ancients saw in fancy's eye emblazoned in the sky did to the fixed points of light themselves, yet since he is always at pains to assure us it is imagination, perhaps we should not complain. And they do add in making the volume interesting, though perhaps without adding greatly to our knowledge.

The volume is divided into five sections coincident with the developing New Testament: The Oral Period, The Period of Paul, The Period of the Fall of Jerusalem, The Period of Persecution, and The Period of the Beginnings of Heresy.

Under each of these headings he discussed the books in a fresh and vigorous way. For example such chapters as The Magna Charta of Christianity (Galatians) and A Picture of the First Great City Church (Corinth) occur in Part II, while in the section devoted to the Period of Persecution we find The Drama of Revelation, An Oration on Loyalty (Hebrews), A Message of Hope (1 Peter), and A Christian Critic (James).

At the close of each chapter there is a section entitled "Directions for Study," consisting of questions for written work, oral discussions, and special assignments. An occasional analysis or outline printed at the head of the chapter is also helpful. Both the Revelation and Fourth Gospel are analyzed as dramas with acts and scenes appropriately indicated.

While from the nature of the book perhaps technical criticism would

be out of place the author shows himself fully aware of the problems that exist and has used the results if not the methods of the modern critical approach.

Doctor Purinton is to be congratulated in the production of a book that should prove of real value to the student and layman in beckoning to these fascinating fields.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

Grace and Personality. JOHN OMAN. New York. Macmillan Company.

AN American edition of an English book, published, first edition, in 1917, second edition, 1919, founded on a series of articles in *The Expositor* in 1911. The book was written during the war, and includes reflections on experiences of the war, but without specific reference to the war itself.

Some others, as well as the reviewer, may have studied this work in the second English edition, in the preface of which we are told that the whole work was revised and a new chapter inserted to meet actual difficulties felt by readers.

The work requires attentive and sustained reading, for it is serious thinking that is presented. The nature of the discussion is such that it cannot be treated for superficial reading, or its problems be given an easy and simple answer.

> The presupposition of the inquiry is that in religion, as in all other subjects, truth can rest securely only on the witness of reality itself, and that, in religion more than any other subject, it must be a witness to ourselves.

The object of the work is to free religion and theology of fictions and forensic concepts, and present them in terms of reason and fact. The author, in this endeavor, opposes well nigh the whole of the main streams of theological thinking. He examines the postulates of the a-priori systems, and reveals their ethical and religious defects; and presents, in their stead, an alternative fundamental conception of God with its implicits; and challenges, in effect, the criticism of reason, fact, and experience.

Explicitly or implicitly theology has been Augustinian (Calvinistic) or Pelagian (Arminian). Superficial modifications characterize some systems; but they have been builded mainly on one of the two alternatives,"—"God is absolute sovereign," or "Man is free." If this ultimate problem for religion and morals has been discussed (for by many it has been ignored as insoluble), it was almost exclusively a theological wrangle as to which of these supposedly only "alternatives" was the sole

truth. Neither advocate has seemed to suspect even, that, by itself neither "alternative" is the whole truth; and only dimly, not with clear vision, recognized that *both may be right.* If there was any rational revolt from either or both systems, it was from their implications and was feebly or not at all justified in a rational and systematic way.

Doctor Oman proposes a resolution of the antinomy which he contends conserves the essential in the concept of sovereignty in God, and the reality of freedom in man.

Some theologians have said, with Augustine and Calvin: God must be conceived as absolute sovereign, or he is not God; and whatever activity in man is conceived as free must be conceived to be such only in a sense in harmony with that sovereignty. Other theologians, with Pelagius and Arminius, have protested that man must be regarded as free, and his personal moral integrity conserved, or he is not man; and any sovereignty attributed to God must be conceived in the light of this fact. Here the plaintiffs have rested their case.

But clearly each of these directly and practically denies the other; no matter how we use words to conceal the thought and fact. Yet both the sovereignty of God and the freedom of man are essential—essential to religion and morals, and to the idea of God and the facts of man's experience.

Doctor Oman sees this with all the theological deductions that attach to the concepts. He recognizes their necessary relation to religion and morals. He sees that neither can be ignored. For instance:

> A person is distinguished from a mere individual by the call to rule, in his own power and after his own insight, his own world. The essential quality of a moral person is moral independence; and an ideal person would be of absolute moral independence. But the essential quality of a *religious* person is to depend on God; and he must be as absolutely dependent, as a moral person must be absolutely independent.

Or again he proposes

> to show how the nature of a person is such and the grace which succors it is such that they cannot be divided, making it appear how a higher sense of responsibility is a deeper humility, and a more entire humility, a more courageous responsibility; or in other words, how *absolute moral independence and absolute religious dependence are not opposites but necessarily one and indivisible.*

Moral independence, religious dependence, freedom and sovereignty, how conceive their union without denial of one or the other, or both?

Doctor Oman proposes to analyze the concept "sovereignty." He sees that involved in it are elements of caprice and irresistible force,

unconditioned by the nature of man or the relation of the sovereign to any other. That is, the sovereignty conceived is that of absolute will, the a-moral will of a czar; the supremacy of an unconcerned ruler, interested in his own glory rather than in the good of his subjects; a creator whose creatures are only the means of glorifying himself; *the sovereignty of force or power,* or *of a non-moral will.*

The author does not reject the idea of sovereignty, but insists that it is *the sovereignty of Fatherhood,* rather than that of the absolute a-moral will and omnipotence. In such sovereignty, the relation of Father and sons conditions and gives character to the exercise of the divine will, the Father acting in grace, and the sons in appreciative love. In this case the relation between God and man is not that of a Commander and commanded; but a paternal-filial relation, exacting only in the sense that God will (must?) reverence the moral personality of men, and man reverence the Personality of God.

Religion and morals alike, arising in this relation of moral persons, *are a commerce, a reciprocity, a divine-human energy and reality.* Always and of necessity they are initially God's act within the spirit of man; and reciprocally man's act in this grace and power of God. Never is religion or morals alone God's act in man, nor alone man's act in view of God; nor first, in part God's act, and in part man's act, but *always a cooperation; God in grace acting in man, and man at once reacting in God.* God is sovereign in the initiation of a gracious personal relation with man, and man's freedom is the grace of that sovereignty. This sovereignty and this freedom consist in religion and life.

The supreme crisis in Christianity was the rejection of infallible authorities on positive moral grounds because it undermined the old dogmatic method.

Infallible authority presupposes grace as mechanically irresistible, which involves conceiving God as a force not a Father (an a-priori assumption in conflict with experience), which can act upon individuals but not in personal ways, for

> a direct force controlling persons as things is no personal relation between God and man; and the religion which rests on it does nothing to maintain the supremest interest of religion, which is the worth of persons over things, and of moral values over material forces.

On the old dogmatic basis,

> God was the absolute and direct might, and all He did without error or failure: and man was the creature of His hand, directly fashioned and needing nothing for his making but the world of power. Then to deal with the Omniscient

was to have infallible truth, to deal with the Supreme was to have absolute legislation, to deal with the Omnipotent to have irresistible succor. Faith was acceptance of infallible truth, justification the coming to terms with absolute legislation, regeneration the inpouring of efficacious grace; and the whole dogmatic edifice stood solid and four-square.

But the old infallibilities are gone, and

we must take on our own shoulders responsibility for our own convictions as well as our own actions, because we ought to know that even a true belief is not for us truth, unless we ourselves see it to be true, and even a right action not moral, unless we ourselves discern it to be right. . . . And once we clearly see that the highest possessions are valueless apart from our possession of them by insight, reverence, and loyalty, we can never return by the way we came.

The desire further to present quotations, representative of these elements in the problem, must be denied. To give typical quotations would involve reproducing nearly the whole book, so compact the reasoning, so concise the statements. It must suffice to note that there is given a comprehensive array of reasonings in justifying the author's thesis such as make the book practically a system of theology. History, Scripture interpretation, religion experience, psychology, philosophy, and ethics all are made to bear witness.

The discussion is a fit antidote for much of the superficial modern religious thinking; and offers a metaphysical ground for a true modern theology. Too freely and unthinking is the modern fling made that a doctrine is metaphysical. Too often are recent religious and ethical teachings concerning themselves with artificial issues and lacking any ground in reality, or validity in reason.

Sometimes a disavowal of metaphysics is made; and the fact that religion and morals are essentially metaphysical, is overlooked. The being of God, the nature of man, their mutual relation, man to man, man to God, God to man—these are not physical. For any one tempted to make the disavowal of metaphysics in his theology an alibi for a theology not thought through, Doctor Oman offers the solution.

SPENSER B. MEESER.

Principles of Christian Living. GERALD B. SMITH. The University of Chicago Press.

ONE may have, in common with his fellow men, a very clear sense that there is a valid distinction between right and wrong; that he "ought" to do the right and refrain from the wrong. He may have also sure and constant reactions of pleasure or pain related to his action; and yet he

may be fronted constantly with the question of *what* is right and *what* is wrong. The latter is clearly a matter to be determined by the judgment, and is therefore directly related to education.

From this point of view Doctor Smith's book is almost without a peer. With its fair and reasonable discussions and its leading questions at the close of each chapter, it demands a critical consideration of actual situations and the application of Christian principles to them, as over against an uncritical, perhaps unthinking acceptance of "moral laws." In this manner Christian morality is presented as a spirit and life, rather than a special legalism. How to live the Christian life, in the varying progressing environment, can never be fitly answered by a set of formulæ rigidly fixed by custom in another age, with its different circumstances, and given authority by long time use; but only by creative effort to interpret the Spirit and mind of Him who lived the ideal life.

This creative effort is well illustrated by the author in the consideration of the church, the family, one's life-work, his recreations, possessions, industrial problems, politics, and conscience.

"The spirit of Jesus," he affirms, "is one of creative adventure rather than of (formal) conformity." "Jesus himself refused to confine his ministry to the conventionally approved circle of religious duties. . ."

The disciples of Jesus *learn of him this spirit,* as well as the findings of Jesus; and he put the immediate good of men then living above the formal code of his time. The test of love, the love which is that in any action which constitutes it a good action, must lead men to turn from much which has been held as morally right. "Only that which is the spontaneous expression of Christian faith and love is truly Christian." The inwardness of morals and religion can never be made to consist with an imposed moral and religious code of another time and other people. One's religious and moral life must be one's own, and in one's own range of judgment and will, to be of essential worth to one. So,—

> The true moral life is in constant poise, ready not only to apply the familiar precepts, but also to discover and meet new needs (in the spirit and mind of Jesus). Christian ethics, in so far as it embodies the spirit of Jesus, will be a creative attitude of moral eagerness rather than complacent conformity to a system.

A faithful training in this course of study should forever free a man from the bondage of moral and religious legalism. We commend this book to every pastor as of value to himself; and eminently so as a text-book for his teaching ministry.

Spenser B. Meeser.

Christian Salvation. A Modern Interpretation. GEORGE CROSS. The University of Chicago Press.

"THE aim of this treatise is not primarily apologetical but evangelistic." Such is the announcement of the author in his preface; and he proposes to answer the question "What must I do to be saved?"

One who reads the book can not question the devout scholarship or reverent purpose of Doctor Cross; but must recognize that this is not a hand-book for professional evangelists, who ask the same question. These would find some difficulty in presenting this answer to the question, and it would be of doubtful practical value in revival services. And this for two reasons: The answer would be difficult for the evangelists to receive understandingly, so long has the earlier Protestant view been accepted as "the gospel"; and it would be difficult for them to present the message so as to make others feel the force of it. With its rather too serious complications of historical and philosophical matter, it is not adapted either for ready comprehension or for the type of conversion sought by the evangelists.

But the author's purpose is not invalidated by these characteristics of his work; and the book is, in the best sense, genuinely evangelistic. It offers the message and material for that newer type of evangelism, in which the present religious consciousness can find hope and salvation. As an exposition of the present understanding of Christian salvation it is one of the richest presentations yet made; and is a synthesis and systematic statement of the best thinking of those who have the modern Protestant point of view.

It is too considerable a work for a brief and cursory review; but the following interesting things may lead not only to a reading of, but a devout study of the book. After a statement and analysis of the question "What shall I do to be saved?" in which he brings into light the deeper significances of the question, he presents and elaborates the early Christian answer with its later modifications under the influence of Greek ideas. In succession he notes the changes wrought in Catholic sacramentarianism, and the later revolutionary trends of early Protestantism.

Historically, he holds that modern Protestantism has been deeply influenced by the scientific and social interests and the conception of a salvation which is present, social, and moral. His thesis may be found in the following quotation:

> If to multitudes of primitive Christians salvation was viewed as deliverance from the power of evil demons, to be completed at the time of the great physical

cataclysm and the bodily advent of the Messiah from the skies; if to the Græco-oriental of a later date it was identical with a transmutation of the corruptible human nature into the likeness of the incorruptible divine nature through the ministration of the divine mysteries; if to the Roman Catholic of a still later date and of another race it was deliverance from the fires of purgatory and hell through the use of the sacraments in priestly hands; and if, finally, to the early Protestant it was mainly a present acquittal before the bar of God through the substitutionary sufferings of Christ and the faith of the believer; to the modern Protestant it is the bringing of the man into such a fellowship with God as gives him a self-mastery and a self-devotion to the highest end of life. It is the entrance into an experience of conscious unity with one's fellow men, a participation in the ministry of a universal good.

This Jesus achieves in men, fulfilling in them their emerging sense of personality as the supreme worth in the universe; making them conscious of sin and the meaning and reality of forgiveness; and reconciles them to God.

Exposing in apt fashion the inwardness and moral reality of sin, and giving vital content (not the forensic interpretation) to forgiveness with a vigor and insight rarely equalled, the author states,

> The reality of the forgiveness of our sins, and of the eternal worth of this experience supplies the basis of all theories of atonement, justification, sanctification, and reconciliation.

But it is in the content of all these terms, rather than the mere use of them, that the wealth of the book lies; and only voluminous quotation could give adequate idea of the author's contribution. An instance or two must suffice. Justification, a legal term, fitly used as figure, but not as statement of actual matters of fact, is defined as follows:

> The act of divine justification is the divine act of bringing men into the pure, holy, sinless, self-denying vicarious life which the Christian believes the life of Jesus Christ is. He saves men from punishment only by saving them from sin.

And of atonement he says,

> In keeping with our exposition of the terms guilt, punishment, justification, we will now say that the Christian atonement is a movement in the hearts of men which brings them into unity of moral purpose and life with Jesus Christ, that is, with God.

To understand this we must enter into the experiences of Jesus, in bearing sin and become with him a fellow saviour of men.

One wishes there had been prepared a comprehensive index, for in diversity of related subjects considered, the volume is encyclopedic. So also, there would be advantages to the average reader in a brief synopsis

of the main stream of thought; for the consideration of historical and philosophical is sometimes diverting enough to make the work seem discursive so far as the doctrine of Christian salvation is concerned.

SPENSER B. MEESER.

Liberal Christianity. WILLIAM PIERSON MERRILL. The Macmillan Co. New York.

WHEN Union Theological Seminary dedicated its new buildings some years ago, the reviewer heard Doctor Merrill address the trustees, faculty, alumni, and students. In this address he noted that the work of the Liberal had been mainly critical and destructive. He pleaded for a more constructive temper and insisted it was time for them to "get a gospel" to preach, a gospel grounded in the more modern view and interpretation of the Bible.

This book is a response to his own plea. It is the gospel according to the Liberal, as over against the Authoritarian on the one side, and the Humanitarian on the other. To the challenge that the Liberal has no gospel this is the reply in terms of power and reality, that will be acceptable certainly to the moderately liberal Christian. The research of the New Testament, from which the material of the book was drawn, and by which the gospel presented is justified, was an experience of the author and not merely an academic interest.

But the author also defines Liberal Christianity. He rather ignores the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy, clearly so far as the terms are concerned, and contrasts the larger differences of temper and ideal which separate the three groups of Authoritarian, Liberal, and Humanitarian. The contrasts include the outward marks and the inward spirit of the movements.

The liberal Christian believes in a thorough-going and confident use of the scientific method of determining what is fact; is supremely interested in present vital spiritual experience, and believes in its essential unity. So he keeps an open mind toward the truth, refusing to admit that any question is irrevocably settled. He holds that the nature and range of the true church is comprehensive and must not be restricted to one type of thought or experience, "not even his own." To this end he trusts in spirit and truth rather than in authority and force.

The fact which deeply conditions his religion, his theology, his message, is his profound interest in the life that now is, and is wholly personal; the religion of personality, for to him the personal is supreme. Religion has wholly to do with the personal values, issues, and processes of life.

To the liberal Christian, God is personal. And nothing else matters much to him in his thinking about God. . . . What impresses him in Jesus is simply and well-nigh wholly His *personality*. What He *was* counts; yes, and what He is, even more.

As to the gospel of salvation the liberal Christian relies on spiritual power to save as he believes God does. Jesus Christ is the revealing of what God is doing all the time,—saving us by living, suffering, and dying with us. He believes that God in Christ is now saving us by his present living grace, of which the cross is the perfect symbol and expression.

Salvation *is* life . . . not only related to goodness; the goodness *is* salvation. . . . It is in that present, vital, spiritual experience of Christ's abiding presence with him that the liberal Christian finds the deepest reality of his religion, and the strongest assurance of its truth and authority.

The author takes the reader through the contrast with other types, as vigorously repudiating what he calls the Humanitarian as he does the Authoritarian. The Humanitarian he defines as one who gives up the idea of divine authority and divine grace, thinks of religion as a system of ethical principles to be practised by forces within one's own nature with a pedagogical help, possibly, from "that excellent person Jesus." For the liberal Christian temper and belief he finds adequate justification in the New Testament, reinterpreting its teachings in the light of modern exegesis. In this chapter is much valuable interpretive matter more or less familiar to students of the New Testament. He closes the book with the claim that Liberal Christianity, as he defines it, is The Hope of the World.

Perhaps few, if any, who call themselves liberal would utterly agree with Doctor Merrill in all his interpretations and theological theses. The true Liberal hesitates before any dogmatic, ancient or modern. It is the temper and attitude, more than any series of beliefs, however new, which makes the Liberal. In these respects Doctor Merrill has made a fair representation. The true Liberal believes that religion is a contemporary interest and life. He reserves the right to define his individual beliefs.

SPENSER B. MEESER.

The Inescapable Christ. WALTER RUSSELL BOWIE. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1925. Pp. 206. Price, $1.50.

THE able young Virginian partly of Baptist ancestry, who lately left the rectorship of the historic St. Paul's church, Richmond, Virginia, to become rector of Grace Church, New York City, has produced, in this

volume, a series of discourses, which might have been sermons, though they have no texts. They gather around the central Figure of our religion and are a good example of the present-day preaching of a conservative-progressive. He sees the fundamental things in the Christian faith, and understands their social implicits. He belongs to a church that lays much stress upon ritual and historic continuities; but these never seem to obscure the religious realities. Even when discussing "The Significance of the Church," no stress upon ecclesiasticism, sacerdotalism, or ceremonialism obscures the body of Christ, reaching out with life and refreshment to needy men. The volume is thoroughly Christo-centric, and keeps in touch with life.

Here is a modern voice raised in the midst of the din of a great metropolis, and without sensationalism, bringing a gospel message to thoughtful minds in simple, convincing, and often beautiful garb. Many, we trust, will stop and listen.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

The Ideals of Asceticism. An Essay in the Comparative Study of Religion. O. HARDMAN, M. A., D. D. New York. The Macmillan Company. Pp. xvi, 232.

"ASCETICISM" has a well-defined meaning in the English language and in religious history. It means physical discipline, more or less severe, practised as a means to higher spiritual life. It is peculiar to no race, religion, or time. It is entirely different in spirit and method from self-control, keeping the body in fitting subjection to the spirit. The latter is inseparable from all religion and even from morality. Doctor Hardman's study of asceticism is unsatisfactory, in the first place, because of his insistence on treating the two distinct ideals and the resulting methods as in fact identical, or as differing at any rate only in degree. The second unsatisfactory characteristic of the book is the bias of the author in favor of asceticism in its proper sense, which he begins to show in the first pages and makes clearer with every successive chapter. The title that would really describe the book would be "An Apology for Asceticism."

The theology that underlies the essay and often comes to the surface, is Catholic. Righteousness is conformity to a divine Code. God must punish sin, man must expiate it. Large place is found for penance, and almsgiving, as means of expiation. It is a theology impossible for Protestants, though many of them retain large fragments of it without due consciousness of their origin or character. One might infer from this book that its author belongs to that wing of the Church of England

that is looking anxiously, but so far with scant encouragement, for reunion with Rome.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

The Historical Development of Christianity. OSCAR L. JOSEPH, Litt. D. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1925. Pp. 189.

ATTEMPTING to give a complete sketch of Christian history in 163 pages, the actual space given to the text in this booklet, may well be considered an impossible task. But Doctor Joseph has been even less successful than his limitations of space would lead us to expect, by yielding to the temptation to try to tell too much. The result is the overcrowding of his narrative with fact, which is fatal to the effectiveness of such an elementary treatise. A considerable knowledge of Christian history is necessary to read the book with understanding. It will serve better as a rapid review for those who have already given the subject study, than as an introduction to Christian history for those ignorant of it. Save for this defect, the work is well done. The author has competent knowledge, and his narrative is well proportioned.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

Early Baptist Missionaries and Pioneers. W. S. STEWART. Philadelphia. The Judson Press. 1925. Pp. 258. $1.50 net.

THE Department of Missionary Education of the Board of Education of the Northern Baptist Convention has rendered notable service to the modern Christian church, but none more promising than the publication of a series of volumes on "Baptist Missionaries and Pioneers," of which this is the first. In the introductory note, Secretary William A. Hill, who is the responsible editor of the projected series, describes the value of the present volume as follows:

> These volumes are suited to the needs of student groups, summer conferences, and young people's societies, and will be especially valuable for mission study classes, discussion groups, and reading courses. In gathering together in condensed form these biographical stories now scattered in many volumes, some of which are out of print or remotely accessible, the author has rendered a distinct service to Baptists everywhere, and has made a valuable contribution to missionary literature.

The early Baptist missionaries and pioneers mentioned in this first volume of the series are Roger Williams, Pioneer of Religious Freedom; William Carey, Missionary, Linguist, Translator, Botanist; Adoniram Judson, Apostle to Burma; Ann Hasseltine Judson, a Willing Sacrifice; William Knibb, Emancipator of Jamaica's Slaves; Madame Henrietta

Feller, Founder of Grande-Ligne Mission; Isaac McCoy, Champion of Indian Rights; John Mason Peck, Christian Pioneer of the Mississippi Valley. The stories of the deathless heroisms of those adventurers in the Kingdom of God are graphically told, and each biographical sketch is accompanied by illustrations of striking appeal.

This volume is a good specimen of the book-maker's art and reflects credit on the publishing house that issues it.

Baptists, both young and old, cannot read too often the stories of their pioneers in the faith who were not content with the past, but opened up new paths in doctrine and practise. And this is the nature of faith. Faith is venturesome, pioneering, exploring. It is human imagination keeping pace with God's progressive self-revelation in men who with him are creating a new heaven and a new earth. The surest way to enlist the cooperation of our restless aspiring ambitious young manhood and womanhood is to place before them the possibilities of adventure and achievement as illustrated in our early missionaries. Nor are our missionaries of today less heroic, or less worthy of emulation. Their achievements are winning recognition as never before. It is significant that the British Empire confers Kaisar-I-Hind medals on missionaries for their services within its dominion, and that recently King Albert of Belgium conferred on William H. Leslie, M. D., of our Baptist Congo Mission the rank and decoration of Chevalier de l'Ordre Royale du Lion for distinguished service in behalf of the natives.

This volume will do much in convincing our youth that enlistment in the service of the Christ of Peace offers abundant opportunities for heroism, for adventure, for victory, for rewards of merit. By substituting new ideals for old, it will help greatly in hastening the coming of a warless world. In the hands of enthusiastic teachers this book will mark an epoch in the lives of thousands of young people during the coming winter.

MILTON G. EVANS.

The Story of Social Christianity. FRANCIS HERBERT STEAD, M. A. Vol. I. From the beginning to the discovery of the New World. Vol. II. From Reformation and Counter-Reformation to the Present Day. London. 1925. Pp. 268, 262.

MR. STEAD is favorably known to many American readers through an inductive study of the teaching of Jesus regarding the Kingdom. This book, which professes to be a study of social Christianity, belongs to a series by various authors, lay and clerical, called "The Living Church." The avowed object of the series as a whole is "to help people to realize what a tremendous factor the Church has been in history." The reader

will probably ask himself how far such purpose has influenced the writer of this contribution to the series.

Certainly a large part of the first volume can be described only as special pleading in behalf of the Church. The opening chapters, in which Mr. Stead describes the social character of early Christianity, are very well done. His examination of the Fathers down to the time of Constantine and the romanizing of the Church under his successors, is worthy of all commendation. It is better work than Harnack and others have done in the same line. But the rest of the volume cannot be given the same praise. The attempt to show that the Catholic Church of the Middle Ages, Greek or Roman, can be regarded as a social institution, or as making any considerable contribution to the solution of social problems, is ingenious but not convincing. He has to contend with, or rather to ignore, too great a body of facts that assert the precise contrary of his thesis.

The same defect mars the second volume. Mr. Stead greatly overstresses the social contribution of the Reformation and its leaders, and to put Loyola and the Counter-Reformation among the social forces of history does not come far short of making his entire thesis seem ridiculous. For the reader will argue: If a writer shows so little discernment, and interprets facts so recklessly here, can he be a safe guide anywhere? The second half of the volume is better, but much too brief and superficial a treatment of recent movements to be satisfactory.

On the whole, the book is a disappointment. Its author might have made it so much better, had he given us an inductive study of history, comparable to his inductive study of the Gospels, instead of an apologetic treatise.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

History of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ. A. W. DRURY. Otterbein Press. Dayton, Ohio. 1925. Pp. 821.

THE first half of the nineteenth century will always be notable in religious history for the number of new denominations that were formed during those years in the United States. Many of them, like the United Brethren, were not the result of deliberate schism or of definite purpose to form a new religious organization, but the gradual product of circumstances. Two of these arose under similar conditions, and in the same region, and from the same impelling causes. The labors of John Winnebrenner resulted in the establishment of "The Church of God" (essentially Baptists), and those of William Otterbein brought into existence the "Church of the United Brethren in Christ" (essentially Meth-

odists). Both were by-products of the General Awakening and the evangelism of Whitefield, and both were a protest against the dead orthodoxy of the German Reformed Mennonites, and other pre-existing sects of Eastern Pennsylvania.

This volume tells very fully the rise and progress of the United Brethren. Forty years ago the author published a biography of Otterbein, which was necessarily also a history of the beginning of the Brethren. This has now been somewhat recast and forms Part I of the present history. Part II traces the progress of the movement after it came to self-consciousness and the scattered groups from several denominations coalesced in the Church of the United Brethren. This official title was not adopted until 1890, but meetings of the Conference began in 1800. Otterbein and Asbury were close friends, and the Methodist polity was adopted with little modification by the new body. Probably nothing hindered the Brethren from becoming a part of the Methodist Episcopal Church from the first, except the fact that all the churches of the new order were German-speaking and much inclined to perpetuate the use of that language. Most of them are still German-speaking, but many churches maintain services in English also.

It is interesting to note that the practical issue on which these churches separated from the older bodies was the holding of revival gatherings, "big meetings," and the evangelical style of preaching that naturally went with such assemblies. The holding of such meetings has long been so much a matter of course that Christians of the present generation find it difficult to understand the bitterness of opposition to them that was general a hundred years ago, or the grounds on which the opposition was based. This history will greatly help readers to a sympathetic comprehension of both sides of this once hot controversy.

Part III is devoted to a survey of the various departments of Church work: the denominational printing and publishing plant, foreign missions, home work, colleges and seminaries, Sunday school, young people's work, ministerial pensions, benevolent homes. Owing to its compact organization, the Church of the United Brethren has been able to undertake and carry forward successfully all these varieties of work, with a success that their numbers and resources would hardly prepare the reader to expect.

The book is a welcome addition to our list of denominational histories, and can be consulted with confidence by all who desire accurate information regarding the Brethren.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

Church School Improvement. W. E. Chalmers, Editor. Philadelphia. The Judson Press. 1925. Pp. 170.

Men must promote such institutions as they exercise faith in, if these are to survive today. The church school is no exception. Competitive agencies and inarticulate purpose threaten its use. Northern Baptists through their Publication Society have proposed an "improvement plan" for their schools with "ten test points." "Church School Improvement" amplifies these "points" to serve as a guide for monthly study groups of church workers.

The manual gathers up a flood of miscellaneous materials representing most phases of church-school enterprise and orders them into focused proportions. One important subject is lacking, an enunciation of the Keystone Lesson Series, particularly the three unit system. Each subject is set forth by a field man in religious education. A tendency to break with the knowledge theory of education is evident throughout the volume. Men are coming to conceive education as process, that children grow religious, that experience is more important than indoctrination. Chapter seven, "Pupil Partnership," represents a timely point of departure in school emphasis.

The materials are not offered in homeopathic measures. In most cases the chapters are replete with relevant data and elementary educational principles. The "Equipment" chapter's suggestions so far outreach the possibilities of typical schools that their leaders may become faint-hearted in their examination of them. In order for a group to make any one theme effective in a single investigation, considerable promotion will probably be necessary on the part of some responsible party. Where the standards of the manual can be brought within calling distance of churchmen, marked improvement in method and spirit will spring in the school.

Stewart G. Cole.

Reality in Worship. Willard L. Sperry. New York. The Macmillan Company. 1925. Pp. 346.

This volume is called "A Study of Public Worship and Private Religion." Doctor Sperry, the dean of the Theological School of Harvard University and professor of Sacred Rhetoric on the Andover Foundation, always expresses himself in a bright and gripping fashion. His rich acquaintance with literature enables him to illumine and adorn his pages with a wealth of suggestion, without overburdening them with borrowed riches.

The author's treatment is wider than the title of the volume would

suggest, yet his chapters on "The Church in History," "The Kingdom of Ends," "Christian Realism," "Religion as Love," and "The Moral Uses of Joy" furnish a useful background for the more direct discussion of matters pertaining to the value, and method of public worship. While the book is not without practical aid to those who would improve their way of conducting congregational worship, it is of chief value in the better understanding of the human springs and divine yearnings which make worship necessary.

The important distinction between the conception of religion as chiefly subjective, and that which refers it to objective reality is insisted upon; and with J. B. Pratt, in his book "The Religious Consciousness," the author makes clear that this difference will manifest itself in one's theory and practise of worship. Protestantism, thinks the author, conceives of and conducts its worship too much as a subjective transaction. Because of this, we get out of touch with the masses, who need the outward and impressive. The large body of subjective hymns and subjective anthems should give way to a wider use of hymns which objectify the spiritual experiences; Scripture lessons and sermon topics, pastoral prayers —indeed, all parts of the public service, thinks Professor Sperry, should be concrete, "masculine, objective," rather than sentimental, self-conscious, subjective. Possibly the author presses this point too far, overlooking the fact that many mystical souls come closer to God by introspection, meditation, inner rapture, than would be possible by any appeal to the outward and sensuous.

All, however, will agree with the author, no doubt, when he says:

> Experience confirmed me in my conviction that to make random experimental changes in an order of worship is no guaranty of a better service. Any and every form of service is capable of substantial improvement without omitting, adding, or rearranging particular items, if only a more scrupulous attention is paid to the material which is to be used. Alterations in the plan of service are superficial remedies for ills which usually are more deep-seated.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

The Children's Bible. Arranged by HENRY A. SHERMAN and CHARLES F. KENT. New York. Scribners. 1925. Pp. xv, 419. $1.75, or $3.50.

PERHAPS no version of the Scriptures makes stronger appeal to little folks than "The Children's Bible." Written in simple English and composed of choice selections of both Testaments, it represents a serious effort on the part of scholarship to introduce the Bible to the child. Topical, paragraph, and direct speech features, with the omission of verse numbering and archaic English, have contributed a distinct realism

and freshness to the text. The reproduction of Biblical poetry in its native setting also lends beauty and meaning to the book. Special attention is due the reproduction of some masterpieces of religious art.

The adoption of striking, though pertinent, topical headings gives expectancy and point to the reader's pursuit. Such episodes as "The Story of the Tower of Babel," or "A Strong Man Who Lost His Strength" will nourish the imaginative needs of little children. Such tales as "Meeting a Brother Who Had Been Wronged," "The Devotion of Ruth," and "A Shepherd Boy Who Was Called to Lead a Nation" will stimulate the heroic in later childhood. The wisdom and music articulate in such poems as "The Joy of Worshiping God" and "The Right Use of the Tongue" will stir the heart of rising youth. The New Testament treatment is no less appealing. The dialogue between the devil and Jesus under the caption, "Jesus Decides How He Will Do His Work" is vital with human drama, heroic decision. "The Way to Learn From Jesus" presents truth in picturesque parables which make ready *entrée* to any junior child. The Pauline narratives, in the particular form the authors present them, become a notable biography for boys and girls. Indeed, the entire work introduces the child to the Scriptures from a perspective peculiar to childhood and hence dynamic with religious values.

The text has been published in two forms—the Biblical materials are identical in each. One is presented in beautiful paper, print, and binding with thirty full-page duotone illustrations; the other in less expensive attire with eight classical illustrations.

STEWART G. COLE.

The Wooing of Rebekah and Other Bible Plays. ROSAMOND KIMBALL. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1925. Pp. 268. Price, $2.50.

THE attempt on the part of representatives of the church to recapture the drama and the pageant, lost for three centuries, to its service and to rededicate their use to purposes of religious and moral education, is one of the interesting developments of recent years. Numerous books have been published giving aid to those who realize the possibilities in this movement to advance religious, particularly Biblical, knowledge, through appeal to action and to the eye. Women have been among the leaders in the new method of instruction.

The distinguishing feature of the volume before us is that the Bible words themselves are used wherever this is dramatically possible—the King James version being chosen, because most familiar and dignified. The device of a *reader,* who gives the setting and fills in the gaps, is made use of, where the actors cannot represent the entire situation.

Besides the Wooing of Rebekah, there are given in dramatic form Jacob's Journey, the Story of Joseph, in five separate parts, Moses in the Bulrushes, Ruth, Samuel in the House of the Lord, David and Jonathan, in four parts, Elijah and Elisha in three parts, The Nativity, The Prodigal Son, The Resurrection. A suggestive introduction assists those who undertake to use the dramas, and several good cuts are helpful for costuming, etc. The plays are interspersed with music which doubtless would heighten the effects. An intelligent trainer of groups of young people and of children could get excellent results by the use of such a book at this. Its mechanical make-up is attractive.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

Modern Religious Verse and Prose. FRED MERRIFIELD. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. 471. Price, $3.50.

THIS collection from the writings of modern seers and singers adds to the numerous anthologies another that is well worth having. Poetry naturally predominates, for it is the poet who sees into the universal heart and bodies forth what he sees in the form best worth preserving. But there are here a number of prose selections, esteemed worthy of a place with the best in verse; as for instance, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, paragraphs from such religionists as James Martineau and Theodore Parker, and such modern writers of fiction as H. G. Wells and A. S. M. Hutchinson. Our greater modern poets are all represented, generally several times; and many of the lesser luminaries appear almost as often.

In such a selection as this by Professor Merrifield (who is assistant in the chair of New Testament History in the University of Chicago) the personal equation must of necessity come in, to determine the choice to be made out of the riches of English verse and prose. One may, however, wonder why Corinne Roosevelt Robinson and Edwin Arlington Robinson should each have a larger number of selections than Lowell or Wordsworth; or why John Hall Wheelock should have almost as many as Whittier, who is more frequently quoted than any other. But the work is well done, and the book-making is pleasing to eye and hand.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

What the Coal Commission Found. An Authoritative Summary by the Staff. Edited by EDWARD EYRE HUNT, F. G. TRYON, JOSEPH H. WILLITS. With a Foreword by John Hays Hammond. Baltimore. 1925. Pp. 416.

AFTER the coal strike of 1922, as some may remember, President Harding appointed a Commission to study the whole coal problem, and to present

their findings of fact and recommendations. That Commission expired by limitation on September 22, 1923, having spent nearly $600,000 and accumulated a mass of fact and testimony that would make several large printed volumes. Congress has failed to order the printing, and accordingly it has been left to private enterprise to make the public acquainted with the results of the Commission's work. This volume is an attempt to do this.

After an introductory chapter on "The Coal Problem," the summary is divided into two parts, the first discussing the bituminous coal industry, the second the anthracite. Several chapters of Part I are equally adapted to Part II and are therefore not repeated, such as "How Coal Is Mined and Sold," "How the Miners Live" and "Causes of Strikes." But such matters as "Costs, Prices and Profits," "Miners' Wages, Hours and Earnings" differ materially in the two industries, and are therefore separately treated.

So far as accumulation of facts is concerned, the Commission did its work only too well. It has brought together a mass of data that is simply bewildering to the non-expert, and will probably be only vaguely grasped by those who have been long in the coal business. Only mental confusion can result from study of these data. A scientific solution of the coal problem appears impossible, and society must proceed by the old, unscientific method of "trial and error."

The Commission practically acknowledges this. Mr. Hammond, one of our first engineers, asserts it in his Foreword. The recommendations of the Commission, appended to their report and reproduced in the final chapter of this book, attempt no solution. Their chief recommendation is more study of the problem by more Commissions, and publicity through reports made by the industry to the Interstate Commerce Commission. One questions if this inconclusiveness may not be the reason why Congress has been loath to spend so much money as would be necessary to print something so nearly valueless. Truly, "the mountains have been in labor and brought forth a mouse!"

HENRY C. VEDDER.

Selected Articles on Prohibition and Modification of the Volstead Law. Compiled by LAMAR T. BEMAN. New York. H. W. Wilson Company. 1924. Pp. 380.

Selected Articles on Capital Punishment. Compiled by LAMAR T. BEMAN. New York. H. W. Wilson Company. 1925. Pp. 366.

Selected Articles on Child Labor. Compiled by JULIA E. JOHNSON. New York. H. W. Wilson Company. 1925. Pp. 371.

THESE three books belong to the "Handbook Series," already numbering more than a dozen volumes, and constituting a noteworthy contribution to the literature of public questions. They much more than fulfil the promise of the titles. First of all, they give the reader an extensive bibliography, including not only books, but public documents and articles in periodicals. Hence one interested in the subject of any volume has placed before him the opportunity to make as exhaustive a study as he wishes. Next a detailed analysis of the subject is offered, with the various arguments *pro* and *con* that have been urged by writers and speakers. Finally, the bulk of the book is given to carefully selected articles that give a sufficiently full treatment of every point in the analysis. The selections have been made with great fairness, and the net result is a fuller discussion of the topic, in all its phases and implications, than any reader can possibly have met with before. The case against prohibition, and the case for prohibition—to take one instance as an illustration—is so fully and candidly presented that whoever takes the trouble to read the book with care will be convinced that nothing more has been said or can be said. There is probably no other series of books that throws so much light on so many pressing social problems. One who wishes to learn, and not merely to have his own present views confirmed, will find them invaluable.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

Science as Revelation. JOHN M. WATSON. New York. The Macmillan Company. 1925. Pp. 303.

IT is pathetic that such a book as this is needed, but it is sorely needed in our day when so many young people are led to believe that science has politely bowed God out of his universe. And the need is mainly due to the rationalism so dominant in Christian history that conceives of religion as Natural and Revealed. This conception may have had its values in a certain stage of theological thinking, but it has entailed errors that such writers as the author of "Science as Revelation" feel called upon to correct.

The word revelation was restricted to a *written* revelation, which God, out of the richness of his mercy had given and marvelously attested to chosen few of the human race, and this revelation is found exclusively in the Old and New Testaments.

This narrow definition has had its nemesis from two directions, first, the study of other "Sacred Books," which make similar claims

for themselves, and, second, the religious nature of man who finds the glory of God in the heavens and the power of God in the storm and the goodness of God in sunshine and in rain. In other words, man is more religious than the theology of the dogmatic theologian will allow. Men believe that God discloses himself in other ways than by written speech, and so they are widening the definition of revelation so as to make it coextensive with any manifestation of divine power and intelligence and purpose. This is abandoning a definition, but not the idea of revelation; a theory, but not the fact. It simply puts the Bible in its relatively proper place in its progressive revelation of God in history, and allows God to speak directly to a modern technically trained astronomer as to an ancient Hebrew shepherd who marveled at the starry hosts.

As a New Testament writer conceived God to have spoken through history in varied forms and manners and in varying degrees of clearness, so Doctor Watson points out how God through modern sciences reveals power and purpose unimagined prior to telescope and microscope and spectroscope. He summons to the witness-stand the astronomer, the physicist, the chemist, the paleontologist, the geologist, the biologist, the anthropologist, the psychologist, the voice of ethics, and the philosopher. These all study nature. They all find law, order, beauty. If religious, they find nature herself a worshipper, as the author suggests by quoting some lines from David Vedder's "The Temple of Nature":

> Talk not of temples; there is one
> Built without hands, to mankind given;
> Its lamps are the meridian sun
> And all the stars of heaven.
> Its walls are the cerulean sky,
> Its floor the earth so green and fair,
> The dome its vast immensity;
> All Nature worships there.

"Science as Revelation" is an admirable introduction to the sciences the author uses as illustration of the idea of revelation. Each chapter is a storehouse of information, so suggestively and eloquently phrased as to spur the reader to further research. It is almost certain that this volume will deepen the feelings of wonder and awe at all of God's marvelous works, and awaken gratitude for all the patient workers in every field of scientific research, for their disclosures of the power and purpose that enfolds us all. The writer of the book has furnished rich material for religious education of persons who are engaged in the study of natural sciences.

MILTON G. EVANS.

Jesus of Nazareth: His Life and His Teaching. JOSEPH KLAUSNER, PH. D., Translated from the original Hebrew by Herbert Danby, D. D. New York. The Macmillan Company. 1925. Pp. 434.

THIS is the most recent of the few books that have been written by Jewish scholars dealing exclusively with the life and teachings of Jesus, based on judicial investigation of sources of information. Hitherto, English Christian readers have depended almost wholly on Rabbinical illustrative material collected by Lightfoot, Schoettgen, and Wetstein, Schuerer's "Jewish People in the Times of Jesus Christ," Edersheim's "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," Herford's "Christianity in Talmud and Midrash," and scattered material in theological journals. Only recently have scholars in any language made a thoroughly critical study of the immense Jewish material that goes under the names Talmud and Midrash. Even Schuerer's great work is in places marked by uncritical method. Doctor Klausner, then, has the advantage of authors named above in having a chance to review their work, and in bringing to his task a more judicial procedure, even though, at some points, his conclusions may be fairly questioned. He has rendered students of the life and times of Jesus invaluable service in gathering Hebrew and Aramaic sources to illustrate or to support his interpretation of Jesus' character and teaching.

This volume is specially interesting to Christians because of its authorship and its purpose. Doctor Klausner was born in Russia in 1874. In 1897 he entered Heidelberg University to study Semitic languages and Philosophy. For his doctor's degree he wrote a thesis on "Jewish Messianic Ideas in the Tannaitic Period." This necessitated minute and patient investigation of Christian origins. The student Klausner had none of the superficial and coarse Jewish objections against Jesus and his messianic claims. He pursued his investigations as a student seeking the facts amid a bewildering mass of material both Jewish and Christian. No Jewish scholars before him had given such close attention to this problem. The result was *Die messianischen Vorstellungen,* published in German in 1904, a book that brought him to the attention of non-Jewish readers. In 1905, Doctor Klausner became editor of *Ha-Shiloach,* the most influential Hebrew periodical, succeeding Asher Ginsberg, the able philosophic exponent of the Zionist Movement. From 1904 to 1919 he held academic positions in Jewish schools in Odessa. In 1920 he went to Palestine, and at once became a leader in the new Hebrew life of the "Jewish National Home." Doctor Klausner writes, then, as a competent scholar and as a Jew, but a Jew of the Zionist outlook. He writes, too,

in and from Jerusalem, a city which Klausner loves and which Jesus loved.

The purpose of the book is significant. In the Introduction, the author writes:

> Of the necessity for such a book it is needless to speak at length; it is enough to say that there has never yet been in Hebrew any book on Jesus the Jew which had not either a Christian propagandist aim—to bring Jews to Christianity—or a Jewish religious aim—to render Christianity obnoxious to Jews. If I can give Hebrew readers a truer idea of the historic Jesus, an idea which shall be alike far from that of Christian or Jewish dogma, which shall be objective and scientific in every possible way, which shall also give some conception of a teaching akin to Judaism, yet at the same time far removed from it, and some conception of the civic, economic, and spiritual environment of the Jews in the days of the Second Temple, an environment which made possible this historical scene and this new teaching—then I shall know that I have filled a blank page (from the point of view of Hebrew writers) in the History of Israel which has so far been written upon almost solely by Christians.

An earlier paragraph reads:

> We have before us two facts: (a) Jesus was born, lived and died in Israel and was a Jew in every respect; (b) his disciples, and still more disciples' disciples, removed far away from Israel, or rather, the more numerous and more powerful of the Jews rejected the teaching of Jesus; they rose up against it during his lifetime and, even when the world drew nearer and nearer to Christianity, would not become Christian. Christianity was born within Israel, and Israel as a nation rejected it utterly. Why?

In another paragraph are the words:

> I have no wish here to argue for or against Judaism and Christianity, but merely to explain and expound the "great contradiction" spoken of by Voltaire. The fact that Judaism gave birth to Christianity proves that Christianity much resembles Judaism; but the fact that Judaism never became Christianity and always followed its own particular path, is a standing witness that in many ways Judaism is not like Christianity. It only remains to show wherein they are alike and wherein they differ, without discussing at all whether the differences are or are not to the advantage of either. Only so can one remain within the limits of pure scholarship and avoid subjectivity. Only by such an attitude to the problem can one keep from becoming a religious or national apologist.

In the closing paragraph he makes the appeal:

> I am quite aware that the method of this book will provoke abundant hostile criticism from Jews and Christians alike. But here again I ask for patience: I have strong hopes that either side, once it reads the book without prejudice, will acknowledge that, whether right or wrong, it is at least written with the

best intentions. I only beg one thing; the book has been written during a long course of years crammed with work and the search for truth; may its readers peruse it with the same good intentions with which it was written!

One who professes to be Christian has listened to the request of an honest truth-seeking Jew and accompanied him throughout his book, and acknowledges gratitude for new insights and new appreciations and new hopes. He has a more discriminating knowledge of the religious and intellectual environment of Jesus, and a surer conviction of ultimate triumph of his ideals for the human race.

Doctor Klausner's book written for Hebrews will become the permanent possession of Gentile scholarship. While not itself the final book on Jesus of Nazareth, every subsequent book will reckon with it and be indebted to it.

MILTON G. EVANS.

A Creed for College Men. HUGH ANDERSON MORAN. New York. Macmillan Company. Pp. 149.

THE college pastor at Cornell University undertakes to discuss some of the fundamental things of the spiritual life in a way that may prove helpful to college men. Recognizing that often intellectual difficulties stand in the way of appreciation of some truths taught in the Christian Scriptures, the author attempts to elucidate such themes as Personality, the Origin and Nature of Evil, the Divinity and Personality of Jesus, Body, Mind, and Spirit, the Idea of the Trinity, the Psychology of Religious Experience, Prayer and Miracles, and the Meaning of the Cross. The discussions are clear, interesting, thoughtful rather than systematic; and the purpose altogether commendable. The Christian life, and particularly the church life of the future is seriously jeopardized, if young people are taught one sort of a God in the Sunday school and another sort in the day-school and college, if they must unlearn their earlier lessons concerning the kind of universe they live in and the kind of Bible they have read. Mr. Moran has undertaken to interpret to the young college man the view of Christian doctrines which can live with the prevailing modern conception of the universe; and at the same time fortify him against some of the false inferences which have been drawn from scientific theories. The book will be found suggestive as the basis for lessons in "discussion groups," and as a corrective for individual doubts that disturb intelligent students in college and university.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.